

Revelation 21–22 in Light of Jewish and
Greco-Roman Utopianism

Biblical Interpretation Series

Editors in Chief

Paul Anderson (George Fox University)
and Yvonne Sherwood (University of Kent)

Editorial Board

Akma Adam (University of Glasgow)
Roland Boer (University of Newcastle, Australia)
Musa Dube (University of Botswana)
Jennifer L. Koosed (Albright College, Reading, USA)
Vernon Robbins (Emory University)
Annette Schellenberg (Theological Seminary, San Francisco)
Carolyn J. Sharp (Yale Divinity School)
Johanna Stiebert (University of Leeds, UK)
Duane Watson (Malone University, USA)
Ruben Zimmermann (Johannes Gutenberg-Universität Mainz)

VOLUME 118

The titles published in this series are listed at brill.com/bins

Revelation 21–22 in Light of Jewish and Greco-Roman Utopianism

By

Eric J. Gilchrest



BRILL

LEIDEN • BOSTON

2013

This publication has been typeset in the multilingual “Brill” typeface. With over 5,100 characters covering Latin, IPA, Greek, and Cyrillic, this typeface is especially suitable for use in the humanities. For more information, please see www.brill.com/brill-typeface.

ISSN 0928-0731

ISBN 978-90-04-25153-3 (hardback)

ISBN 978-90-04-25154-0 (e-book)

Copyright 2013 by Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, The Netherlands.

Koninklijke Brill NV incorporates the imprints Brill, Global Oriental, Hotei Publishing, IDC Publishers and Martinus Nijhoff Publishers.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, translated, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without prior written permission from the publisher.

Authorization to photocopy items for internal or personal use is granted by Koninklijke Brill NV provided that the appropriate fees are paid directly to The Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Suite 910, Danvers, MA 01923, USA.

Fees are subject to change.

This book is printed on acid-free paper.

To Kendel,
with whom I journey to find utopia,
and without whom utopia is entirely unimaginable

CONTENTS

Acknowledgments	xi
1. Introduction	1
1.1. The Task of the Project	1
1.2. Definition of Utopia	1
1.3. Methodology	3
1.4. The <i>Topoi</i> of Utopia	9
1.5. Significance of the Project	10
2. Greco-Roman Utopia	12
2.1. Introduction	12
2.2. The Categories of Utopian Expression	14
2.2.1. Political Utopianism	14
2.2.2. Primitivistic Utopianism	17
2.2.3. Afterlife Utopianism	23
2.3. The <i>Topoi</i> of Greco-Roman Utopias	29
2.3.1. Setting	30
2.3.2. Wealth and Communism	36
2.3.3. Temples	46
2.3.4. Rivers/Water	48
2.3.5. Wine	50
2.3.6. Food	50
2.3.7. Pleasant Fragrances	53
2.3.8. Music	54
2.3.9. Light	56
2.3.10. Climate	58
2.3.11. War and Peace	59
2.3.12. Citizens	66
2.3.13. Work	74
2.3.14. Divine Presence	76
2.4. Conclusion	81
3. Jewish Utopia	83
3.1. Introduction	83
3.2. The Categories of Utopian Expression	84

3.2.1. Edenic Utopianism	86
3.2.2. Nationalistic Utopianism	99
3.2.3. Eschatological Utopianism	106
3.3. The <i>Topoi</i> of Jewish Utopias	123
3.3.1. Setting	123
3.3.2. Wealth	125
3.3.3. The Temple	137
3.3.4. Rivers/Water	141
3.3.5. Wine	147
3.3.6. Food	149
3.3.7. Pleasant Fragrances	163
3.3.8. Music	166
3.3.9. Light	167
3.3.10. Climate	172
3.3.11. War and Peace	173
3.3.12. Citizens of Utopia	179
3.3.13. Work	192
3.3.14. Divine Presence	195
3.4. Conclusion	198
4. The Utopia of Revelation 21–22	201
4.1. Introduction	201
4.2. The Audiences of Revelation	205
4.3. Revelation 21–22 as Utopian Vision	208
4.3.1. Setting	209
4.3.2. Wealth	214
4.3.3. Temple	223
4.3.4. Rivers/Water	227
4.3.5. Wine	235
4.3.6. Food	235
4.3.7. Pleasant Fragrances	242
4.3.8. Music	246
4.3.9. Light	248
4.3.10. Climate	251
4.3.11. War and Peace	252
4.3.12. Citizens	254
4.3.13. Work	260
4.3.14. Divine Presence	264
4.4. Conclusion	265

5. Conclusion 270

Appendices

 Appendix A 279

 Appendix B 284

Bibliography 289

Index Ancient Sources 309

Index of Subjects 329

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Over the course of these last years, I have come to recognize that a village is required not only for raising a child but for writing a book as well. From professional mentors, to family, to friends who cared for my family and me, I am deeply grateful and profess profound thanks.

This book is a revision of my doctoral dissertation at Baylor University. For that reason, I would first like to thank Baylor University Department of Religion for giving me the opportunity to pursue a Ph.D. and for creating a culture that encourages first-rate scholarship through critical instruction in the classroom and collegiality outside of the classroom. My dissertation advisor, Dr. Lidija Novakovic, deserves enormous thanks. She has walked with me step-by-step through the writing process and has been an irreplaceable sounding board for ideas that made their way into this work and others that did not. Her ability to dispense discerning criticism with an exterior of grace is a gift. I wish also to thank Dr. Mikeal Parsons who served on my dissertation committee, has been a mentor at many times and in many ways, and has given me repeated opportunities to develop my scholarship over the course of my tenure at Baylor. Finally, I wish to thank Dr. Ken Jones, Dr. James Nogalski, and Dr. Bill Bellinger who served on my dissertation committee and gave insightful comments and critique.

This book owes much to the numerous friends and family who supported and encouraged me and my family over the course of these last years. To my parents, Brian and Sherry Gilchrest, I am forever indebted for the never-ending support and love I have felt throughout my life. You are models of Christian maturity, and your sacrificial journey will forever be the bar by which I measure my own life. To my wife's parents, Karen and Russ Byron, there are not enough ways to thank you for the tireless treks from Lexington to Waco. Despite the distance, you were always present when we needed help the most, and your love and care for Ezra and Lizzie are invaluable to me. To the Guests and the Camps, our dearest friends, you have been a source of inspiration, love, and most of all hope throughout these years. To my colleagues in the Religion Department, the revolving door of students who shared life with us so closely and cared for our children so that my wife could work and I could write, Cindy Williams, the community of DaySpring Baptist Church, and those in Baylor campus life, I say thank you because you are Waco to me.

But most of all, words fail to express the love and admiration I have for my wife, Kendel. For the last eleven years, you always believed in me, always supported me, and always stood by me. Our two beautiful children are a joy and an inspiration to me. I am a better person and a better scholar because of you. This book does not exist without you.

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1. THE TASK OF THE PROJECT

In Revelation 21–22, the author paints a vivid description of the new Jerusalem, an eternal city in which God will dwell with the righteous after the final judgment. The author uses a number of stock images prevalent throughout the ancient world in discussions of the blessed afterlife and/or utopian communities. Streets of gold, walls of precious gems, rivers, absence of darkness, and fruit with healing properties are all consistent with elements found in Greco-Roman and Jewish expectations regarding the good life. Scholars have occasionally recognized the similarities in Greco-Roman, Jewish, and Christian expectations of the afterlife, but no study to date has attempted to map out a detailed portrait of utopia. As a result, there has not been a full-scale study devoted to Revelation's use of utopian imagery. The task of this study, therefore, is twofold. First, it attempts to clearly articulate the utopian expectations of the ancient world as found in Jewish and Greco-Roman literature, and, second, it proceeds to read Revelation 21–22 as an eschatological utopian description drawing on the expectations articulated in the first part of the study.

1.2. DEFINITION OF UTOPIA

The term *utopia* was coined by Thomas More in the 16th century, and its initial “u” is commonly understood to be a wordplay—“ou” *topos* (“no place”) and “eu” *topos* (“good place”). Though the latter sense is primarily intended throughout this work—and thus a working definition of utopia is *a place where the good life is lived*—there is a real sense in which utopia is always longed for but never achieved and in that sense “no place.”¹ All utopian aspirations addressed in this study, whether Greco-Roman or Jewish, whether of the past, present, or future, are indeed *aspirations*

¹ Rhianon Evans similarly defines utopia as “an ideal, livable community” (*Utopia Antiqua: Readings of the Golden Age and Decline at Rome* [London: Routledge, 2008], 3).

more than they are “reality.” They are cultural memories of the Golden Age, sailors’ tales of exotic islands, philosophers’ dreams of a perfect city, and awaited expectations about the blessed life to come. At the heart of utopia, then, is longing or desire. It is a desire for a reality that does not yet exist, and the utopian vision gives voice and space to such a reality, even if it only exists in the mind and in the text.²

In this way, even though the term utopia is not drawn from ancient usage, is not a word that can be found in the Greek lexicon, and is, therefore, necessarily anachronistic as a description of an ancient phenomenon, it is an idea common to many peoples, societies, and cultures.³ As Moses Finley reminds us, “all Utopian thinking has an element of fantasy, of dreaming, or at least of yearning, for a better life and a better world. And *all men* [sic.] dream in this way, about themselves and their families if not about society in general or the world at large.”⁴ In fact, most scholars recognize that the flower of utopian expression (post-Morean utopianism) has its roots in the ancient world as evidenced by the great number of primers on utopianism that devote an introductory chapter to ancient utopianism.⁵ The grand idea of utopianism is thus not unique to any age,

² Paul Fiddes notes the importance of desire in constructing utopias, and (speaking from a Christian perspective) suggests the presence of the divine as an important part of this desire. As shown in chapters two and three, this desire is particularly Jewish (and Christian) but not Greco-Roman (Paul S. Fiddes, *The Promised End: Eschatology in Theology and Literature* [Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 2000], 219–61). See also Evans who points out that desire is at the heart of utopia (*Utopia Antiqua*, 2).

³ For this reason, Sargent states: “Although the word *utopia* and the literary genre resulted from the book now known as *Utopia* by Thomas More, the phenomenon long predated the book. It is not possible to specify the first appearance of utopianism, but early expressions are found on Sumerian clay tablets, in the Old Testament, and in the poetry of Hesiod in the eighth century BCE, and utopian speculation played a central role in the philosophic and political debates of fifth-century BCE Athens” (Lyman Tower Sargent, “Utopian Traditions: Themes and Variations,” in *Utopia: The Search for the Ideal Society in the Western World* [ed. R. Schaer, G. Claeys, and L. Sargent; New York: Oxford University Press, 2000], 8).

⁴ Emphasis mine. Moses I. Finley, “Utopianism Ancient and Modern,” in *The Critical Spirit: Essays in Honor of Herbert Marcuse* (ed. K. H. Wolff and B. Moore; Boston: Beacon Press, 1967), 3. Though the spirit of Finley’s quotation is certainly right, Ruth Levitas warns that many aspects of utopianism are not innate or universal to all people, and many people and societies do not reflect any notion of utopian thinking (*The Concept of Utopia* [Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1991], 181–82; cf. Howard P. Segal, *Utopias: A Brief History from Ancient Writings to Virtual Communities* [Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell, 2012], 7).

⁵ For examples of modern histories with only a brief introduction to ancient utopias, see Frank E. Manuel and Fritzie P. Manuel, *Utopian Thought in the Western World* (Cambridge, Mass.: The Belknap Press, 1979); Joyce Oramel Hertzler, *The History of Utopian Thought* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1923); Lewis Mumford, *The Story of Utopias* (New York: The Viking Press, 1962); Roland Schaer, Gregory Claeys, and Lyman Tower

even if the elements that make up an age's utopia are. For these reasons, despite the anachronistic nature of the word, utopia is a fitting term for describing a human longing common to all people of all times.

One final point regarding the definition of utopia is that, as Steven Schweitzer has suggested, there are three manifestations of utopianism: "(1) as the *literary genre* of utopia; (2) as an *ideology* through which the world is viewed; and (3) as a *sociological* movement that writes utopias."⁶ This study is interested in the second. It is not concerned with literary utopias or with utopian sociological movements—though these movements can be found in the ancient world and inform a utopian ideology⁷—but with works that contain utopian descriptions. Such descriptions are found in a variety of literary genres.

1.3. METHODOLOGY

The methodology of this project proceeds in two major parts. Chapters two and three offer a robust description of ancient utopianism by compiling various traditions associated with fourteen specific motifs that are consistently present in utopian expectations. The data is therefore culled and organized by means of a topical approach under the banner of utopianism. Though ancient utopianism has received considerable scholarly attention, there is no true parallel to the approach taken in these chapters in that they attempt to discern specific motifs and traditions that surround those motifs as a means of defining and clarifying the nature of utopia as place.⁸ By using the rubric of utopianism, this study aggregates

Sargent, eds., *Utopia: The Search for the Ideal Society in the Western World* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2000); Michael Winter, *Compendium utopiarum: Typologie und Bibliographie literarischer Utopien*. Vol. I: *Von der Antike bis zur deutschen Frühaufklärung* (Stuttgart: J. B. Metzler, 1978).

⁶ Steven James Schweitzer, *Reading Utopia in Chronicles* (Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies 442; New York: T&T Clark, 2007), 14.

⁷ For a study on utopian communities in the ancient world, see especially Brent James Schmidt, *Utopian Communities of the Ancient World: Idealistic Experiments of Pythagoras, the Essenes, Pachomius, and Proclus* (Lewiston, NY: Edwin Mellen Press, 2010).

⁸ Doynce Dawson works largely with political utopianism looking primarily at the works of Plato, Aristotle, the Cynics, and the Stoics (*Cities of the Gods: Communist Utopias in Greek Thought* [New York: Oxford University Press, 1992]). John Ferguson's work includes political utopianism as well as other forms of utopianism, what this study calls primitivist and afterlife utopianism (*Utopias of the Classical World* [Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1975]). Rhiannon Evans looks primarily at Roman literature (*Utopia Antiqua*). Biblical scholars are not afraid to use the language of utopia (see footnote 1 of chapter three for examples), but there are very few studies that attempt to classify what is meant by

disparate traditions under a unifying theme, a theme that helps explicate Revelation 21–22 in chapter four.

In chapter four, however, the methodology shifts and is somewhat unique among biblical scholarship. In this chapter, Revelation 21–22 is read from the vantage point of two specific readers, both of whom are located as first-century readers, one of whom reads with a worldview shaped by Greco-Roman literature and traditions, the other of whom reads with a worldview shaped by Jewish literature and traditions. By doing so, this study demonstrates how the diversity within Revelation's earliest readership would have informed differing perceptions of the book.

The closest parallel to such a methodology is Peter Oakes' *Reading Romans in Pompeii*, which will provide a point of departure for further clarification of the methodology of chapter four.⁹ Oakes reads Romans from the perspective of four characters he has constructed based on archaeological research done in Pompeii and sociological reconstructions of urban areas in ancient Rome. The four characters are: Sabina, a very poor, Christian stoneworker; Holconius, a cabinet-maker with a modest income and a fair-sized house within which a house church meets; Iris, a sexually-exploited, female slave and barmaid; and Primus, a male slave. The choice of characters is purposeful in that they allow him to read the text through a variety of contextual lenses: male/female, poor/non-poor,¹⁰ and slave/free. Through the lenses of these four characters, Oakes proceeds to argue for a reading of Romans "at ground level." His book grows

this term. Exceptions include Mary Ann Beavis, *Jesus & Utopia: Looking for the Kingdom of God in the Roman World* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2006); and on a smaller scale, John J. Collins, "Models of Utopia in the Biblical Tradition," in *A Wise and Discerning Mind: Essays in Honor of Burke O. Long* (BJS 325; ed. S. M. Olyan and R. C. Culley; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2000), 51–67.

⁹ Peter Oakes, *Reading Romans in Pompeii: Paul's Letter at Ground Level* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2009); cf. Peter Oakes, "Jason and Penelope Hear Philippians 1.1–11," in *Understanding, Studying and Reading: New Testament Essays in Honour of John Ashton* (ed. C. Rowland and C. H. T. Fletcher-Louis; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998), 155–64; Robert Tannehill, "'Cornelius' and 'Tabitha' Encounter Luke's Jesus," *Interpretation* 48 (1994): 347–56. For a recent work using a methodology similar to the one used in this study, see Sean Michael Ryan, *Hearing at the Boundaries of Vision: Education Informing Cosmology in Revelation 9* (LNTS 448; New York: T&T Clark, 2012). Ryan constructs two audiences, an educated and an uneducated audience, and reads the cosmology of Revelation 9 through these two lenses.

¹⁰ Oakes intentionally does not make the dichotomy between the poor and the very wealthy since he argues that there were many craftworkers, particularly wood workers, who would have had a sufficient income with large living spaces. But these should be differentiated from the wealthy class. It would not be entirely inappropriate to label them as upper-middle class.

out of two trips to Pompeii and work done there, an experience he reflects upon in the following quotation:

It was not so much the details of the Pompeian evidence. It was the experiencing of Pompeii. The sense of many different first-century lives, lived cheek by jowl in this mass of houses, apartments, shops and workshops. How could we still read first-century Christian texts as though they were addressed to generalities such as 'gentile Christians'? Life was full of many, varied people, then as now. Surely these texts were written for such people rather than for the somewhat abstract entities that inhabit the pages of most academic books?¹¹

The questions posed here provide an appropriate backdrop for the present study. And though this study does not contain the complex figures Oakes has, nor does it interact with as many social lenses, it does attempt to take seriously the fact that the ancient texts we read, whether Romans or Revelation, were addressed to people of varied backgrounds and life experiences.

In chapter four, the data that is amassed in chapters two and three is employed in the reading of Revelation 21–22 in an attempt to vivify a first-century context, complete with the complexity concomitant with any “real” historical context. This chapter offers a reading of the vision of the new Jerusalem with a critical eye toward the cultural variety in John’s audience, Jewish and Greco-Roman. Thus it reads Revelation from the perspective of two readers, one whose cultural repertoire is drawn entirely from the Greco-Roman material set forth in chapter two, and the other whose cultural repertoire comes from the Jewish material in chapter three. Both readers, of course, are also expected to be close readers of Revelation as a whole and use other data from Revelation to inform how they should understand the final two chapters.

Revelation is unique among New Testament literature in that it is both a letter and a narrative. Further, the seven letters to the seven cities sets an expectation that this book was to be read and interpreted not by one monolithic community but by, at least, seven different communities. Each community receives a specific message within the first three chapters, but all seven hear the same narrative. According to Richard Bauckham, “the seven messages provide seven different introductions to the rest of the book. John has designed a book which, very unusually, is intended

¹¹ Oakes, *Reading Romans in Pompeii*, xi.

to be read from seven explicitly different perspectives.”¹² For this reason, the book of Revelation provides a unique case for the methodology proposed here in that it, in a very real sense, *requires* the interpreter to take seriously the variety within the audience that was intended to hear this text. Certainly the Laodiceans, who are threatened to be “spit out” of God’s mouth, will read Revelation differently than the Smyrnans, who are praised and said to be inwardly rich.

One can take Bauckham’s statement a step further, however, by recognizing the diversity that likely existed within each individual community. The variety includes, at the least, men and women, old and young, Jew and Gentile, educated and uneducated, rich and poor, elite and lower class, and slave and free.¹³ Unfortunately, space does not permit us to address such complexity in its fullness, and as a result the methodology of this study remains modest in scope limited to the differences between Jewish and Greco-Roman traditions. A reading that incorporates other complexities, however, would be a worthwhile endeavor.

In order to further elucidate the methodology employed in chapter four, it can be differentiated from other methodologies that may appear similar. The methodology is an audience-oriented approach which embraces the notion that meaning is made not only in the mind of a text’s author but also in the interaction of a text with its reader or auditor.¹⁴ Rather than asking what John was *intending* to say in Revelation 21–22, this methodology is interested in what John’s original audience *might have heard* John say.¹⁵ A number of audience-oriented approaches have been around for some

¹² Bauckham, *The Theology of the Book of Revelation* (New Testament Theology; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 14. Bauckham rightly suggests that the letter was likely intended for a larger audience than these seven churches, and the number seven, the number of completion, is meant to represent the entirety of Christian churches (see p. 16).

¹³ For more on the audience of Revelation, see the section in chapter four, “The Audience of Revelation.” See Ryan, *Hearing at the Boundaries of Vision*, for a study on educated and uneducated readers of Revelation.

¹⁴ Throughout, this work frequently uses “auditor” rather than “reader,” primarily because ancient texts were more often heard than read given the low literacy rates of the ancient world and the limited access to texts in general. The first audience of the Apocalypse did not truly *read* it. Nevertheless, when the term *reader* is used in the context of ancient readings, it is merely a circumlocution for *auditor* and an attempt to vary the vocabulary. It should not be understood as a misrepresentation of how ancients performed texts.

¹⁵ Christopher Stanley has an excellent piece on Paul’s original audience (he calls it the “real audience”) and whether or not it was truly capable of hearing all that Paul was doing in his letters and all that modern scholarship attributes to the “meaning” of Paul’s letters (Christopher D. Stanley, “Paul’s ‘Use’ of Scripture: Why the Audience Matters,” in *As it is*

time now, and the number of “readers” that one might pose has increased exponentially (e.g. “actual reader,” “ideal reader,” “mock reader,” “implied reader,” “informed reader,” etc. etc.).¹⁶ The specific reader one has in mind certainly has implications for how that text would be understood.

A few important distinctions must be made between the “readers” defined by this study and other “readers” that have been proposed by literary critics. First, the readers of this methodology are not part of the “authorial audience” as defined by Rabinowitz.¹⁷ For Rabinowitz, the authorial audience consists of those people whom the author has in mind when writing his or her work. The authorial audience, therefore, is a hypothetical construct within the mind of the actual author. In contrast, the readers of this study do not stand in a one-to-one correlation with the audience to whom the author of Revelation intends to write. There is likely overlap, and the Greco-Roman and Jewish chapters will no doubt inform the kind of repertoire one would need to read as an “authorial audience,” but the readers of this study stand outside the control of the author. It is almost certain that the actual audience—that is, the flesh and blood audience who reads the work—was made up of people who were beyond the scope of John’s *intended* audience. We do not, however, have access to the constituents of the actual audience. In its stead we can construct the kind of audience that might have read this work based on our knowledge of the people living at its inception. This hypothetically constructed audience, which may be larger in scope than John had intended, is here called the “original audience.” The language of “original audience” is used by many biblical scholars as a nonspecific reference to the kind of people who would have first received a given document without the specificity implied in the term “actual audience,” an audience to which very few ancient historical documents have access. This study, therefore, uses the phrase *original audience* as a way of designating the seven churches to whom John wrote, while also recognizing that this audience

Written: Studying Paul’s Use of Scripture [ed. S. Porter and C. Stanley; SBLSymS 50; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2008], 125–55, esp. 136–46).

¹⁶ For a review of audience-oriented approaches, see Susan R. Suleiman, “Introduction: Varieties of Audience-Oriented Criticism,” in *The Reader in the Text: Essays on Audience and Interpretation* (ed. S. R. Suleiman and I. Crosman; Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1980).

¹⁷ Rabinowitz, “Truth in Fiction: A Reexamination of Audiences,” *Critical Inquiry* 4 (1977): 121–41; idem, “Whirl without End: Audience Oriented Criticism,” in *Contemporary Literary Theory* (ed. G. Douglas Atkins and Laura Morrow; Amherst: University of Minnesota Press, 1989), 81–100.

is not an “actual audience” because we do not have access to actual, flesh and blood, readers.

Also, these readers are not “implied readers.”¹⁸ Iser’s implied reader is an entity that is created by and exists within the text itself. The text creates both an implied reader and an implied author, which should be distinguished from the actual author and actual reader. In a provocative work by David Barr, Barr takes up the issue of the reader of Revelation and asks the penetrating question—“Can we describe the *original* readers of the Apocalypse?”—the very question the present study raises.¹⁹ He poses two ways of constructing the original reader. The first way is to use “historical and social data from late first-century Asia Minor,”²⁰ and the second, the one he opts for, is to appeal to the reader as “laid down in the text,” a quote from Iser and a reference to the implied reader. These two options, however, are significantly different, something Barr fails to mention. The implied reader is located within the text, while the other reader, the original reader, is located outside of the text based on historical data concerning Asia-Minor. Unfortunately, Barr subsumes these two readers under the title “original reader,” a title this work reserves for the reader constructed outside the text.

Reading with the original reader, as defined here, is quite obviously differentiated from an author-centered approach and should not be confused with Rabinowitz’s “authorial audience” which is an extension of the author; nor should it be confused with Iser’s “implied reader” which is constructed from within the text. Instead, the original audience is an audience that is “in front of the text” but, due to the limitations of historical inquiry, is necessarily constructed by modern scholarship since we do not have access to an actual audience. The construct proposed here is quite simple and assumes that John’s audience contains members who are versed in the Jewish tradition and members versed in Greco-Roman traditions. Rather than creating four (or more) complex figures such as Oakes’ characters, this study is limited to cultural differences between a

¹⁸ The implied reader owes its roots to Wolfgang Iser and, later, Seymour Chatman (Wolfgang Iser, *The Implied Reader: Patterns in Communication in Prose Fiction from Bunyan to Beckett* [Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1974]; Seymour Chatman, *Story and Discourse, Narrative Structure in Fiction and Film* [Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1978], esp. 147–51). For an example of Revelation through the lens of “implied reader,” see David L. Barr, “The Reader of/in the Apocalypse: Exploring a Method,” *Eastern Great Lakes and Midwest Biblical Society Proceedings* 10 (1990): 79–89.

¹⁹ Barr, “The Reader of/in the Apocalypse,” 81; emphasis his.

²⁰ Barr, “The Reader of/in the Apocalypse,” 81.

Jewish auditor hearing with Jewish traditions and a Greco-Roman auditor hearing with Greco-Roman traditions.

The question of the makeup of Revelation's original audience is addressed in chapter four. Briefly, however, it is worth noting that we know that John has sent this letter to seven different churches in seven Asian cities, large urban centers that contain a significant amount of diversity. Given early Christianity's mission to both Jew and Gentile (especially noted in Paul's and Ignatius' letters, both of whom write to churches in this region), at the very least we can be certain that these churches contain both Jewish and Gentile members with varying levels of education, particularly religious education. Chapter four plays on this diversity and reads Revelation 21–22 from the perspective of these two audiences.

1.4. THE *TOPOI* OF UTOPIA

As a way of fleshing out the details of Greco-Roman and Jewish utopianism, fourteen motifs, or what are here called *topoi*, are posited as recurring aspects of the ancient utopian vision.²¹ The word *topos* is not meant to invoke a precise use of the term as found among ancient rhetoricians.²² Thus Aristotle's, Quintilian's and Cicero's definitions are of little interest to this study. In this way, the word is not used in a technical sense from the perspective of ancient rhetorical practices. Instead, it is used as a reference to one of the fourteen recurring motifs. In fact, the fourteen *topoi* often serve as broad categories within which other motifs are discussed, motifs that serve as distinguishing characteristics of a given culture. One example will suffice. The *topos* of "food" serves as the broader category within which are found the motifs of utopian abundance and agricultural technology, for the Greco-Roman, and the motifs of utopian abundance, eschatological banquets, and the trees of the garden of Eden, for

²¹ Doron Mendels ("Hellenistic Utopia and the Essenes," *HTR* 72 [1979]: 207–22) also uses the word *topoi* to describe aspects of utopia commonly found in a variety of ancient works.

²² The definition of *topos* has received considerable attention among New Testament scholars and, of late, scholarship is moving in the direction of a broad use of this term. For a recent review of both the primary literature and recent scholarship, see James R. McConnell Jr., "The Topos of Divine Testimony in Luke-Acts" (Ph.D. diss., Baylor University, 2009), 32–63; cf. Johan C. Thom, "The Mind is its Own Place': Defining the Topos" in *Early Christianity and Classical Culture: Comparative Studies in Honor of Abraham J. Malherbe* (ed. J. T. Fitzgerald, T. H. Olbricht, and L. M. White; NovTSup 110; Leiden: Brill, 2003), 555–73.

the Jew. The term *topos*, therefore, though not used in a technical sense rhetorically, is used in a semi-technical sense as defined by this study in that it signals to the reader that the motif being referenced belongs to one of the fourteen categories parsed out for as a broader utopian category.

The *topoi* provide what anthropologists refer to as an etic account of a given culture because the account is drawn not from within the culture but from without. Etic accounts use categorical distinctions that the culture itself does not use in contrast to emic accounts which utilize the language and categories of a given culture in order to organize their thought world. This study sets the categories of utopia, the fourteen *topoi*, and drags a vast amount of literature through the categories in order to show that these categories indeed make sense of and elucidate ancient utopianism as a whole.

1.5. SIGNIFICANCE OF THE PROJECT

This work supplements three specific holes found in the scholarship. First, though biblical scholarship has begun to use the language of utopianism with increasing frequency, there is a lack of refinement with how the term is used. Through a descriptive process using fourteen specific motifs found in utopian descriptions, this study attaches various traditions to the concept of utopianism in order to fill out its definition for both Greco-Romanism and Judaism.

Second, scholarship has been nearly silent regarding the crossroads of Revelation 21–22 and Greco-Roman backgrounds.²³ The paucity of research here is striking given the deluge of studies on John's use of Jewish sources and given the audience to whom John is writing.²⁴ David Mathewson,

²³ Of the few studies that have been published concerning the last two chapters of the book, they deal with the topic of Hellenistic and Roman city planning. Two studies in particular are worthy of note: Dieter Georgi, "John's 'Heavenly' Jerusalem" in *The City in the Valley: Biblical Interpretation and Urban Theology* (SBL 7; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2005), 161–86; trans. of "Die Visionen vom himmlischen Jerusalem in Apk 21 und 22," in *Kirche: Festschrift für Günther Bornkamm zum 75. Geburtstag*. (ed. D. Lührman and G. Strecker; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1980), 351–72; Unyong Sim, *Das Himmlische Jerusalem in Apk. 21,1–22,5 im Kontext biblisch-jüdischer Tradition und antiken Städtebaus* (Bochumer Altertumswissenschaftliches Colloquium 25; Trier: Wissenschaftlicher Verlag, 1996). For a short review of city planning, see also Jeffrey Marshall Vogelgesang, "The Interpretation of Ezekiel in the Book of Revelation," (Ph.D. diss., Harvard University, 1985), 124–26.

²⁴ For Revelation's use of the Hebrew Scriptures, see especially, G. K. Beale, *The Use of Daniel in Jewish Apocalyptic Literature and in the Revelation of St. John* (Lanham, Md.: University Press of America, 1984); Steve Moyise, *The Old Testament in the Book of Revelation*

who has written the most recent monograph on the Old Testament in Revelation 21–22, concludes his work with the following remark, “More work could perhaps be done in this area, in considering the effect and relationship of John’s allusion to the Old Testament and the Greco-Roman background of the readership. The possibility that John has employed imagery which evoked a range of associations, both Jewish and Greco-Roman, should be given serious consideration.”²⁵ What Mathewson has recognized, and what this present study begins to remedy, is the largely overlooked need for Greco-Roman background studies in Revelation.

Third, the methodology used in this study is worthy of further consideration. The field of biblical studies has long taken an interest in the reader’s role in meaning making. Reader-response criticism, for example, has now received widespread popularity as a legitimate hermeneutical endeavor. For reader-response critics, however, the “reader” is always a modern reader. The methodology used here gives credence to the role of the *ancient* reader and the various ways a text might have been heard in its original context. The dearth of attention given by biblical scholars to such an endeavor is perhaps not entirely surprising given the difficulty of reconstructing an ancient reader and the necessarily hypothetical nature of the project. Nevertheless, this study shows that the endeavor is worthwhile, if at times arduous. Ultimately, it is an attempt to animate history, giving voice to the complexity and ambiguity present in historical development.

(Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995); Mathewson, *A New Heaven and a New Earth: The Meaning and Function of the Old Testament in Revelation 21.1–22.5* (JSNTSup 238; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2003); Jan Fekkes, III, *Isaiah and Prophetic Traditions in the Book of Revelation: Visionary Antecedents and their Developments* (JSNTS up 93; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1994); Marko Jauhiainen, *The Use of Zechariah in Revelation* (WUNT 2:199; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005); William J. Dumbrell, *The End of the Beginning: Revelation 21–22 and the Old Testament* (Homebush West, NSW: Lancer Books, 1985).

²⁵ David Mathewson, *A New Heaven and a New Earth*, 233.

CHAPTER TWO

GRECO-ROMAN UTOPIA

2.1. INTRODUCTION

Doyne Dawson, in his work on utopianism in the ancient world, divides ancient utopian descriptions into two categories: folk utopias and political utopias.¹ The category of folk utopias includes, for example, the legend of the Golden Age, the Elysian Fields, and any adaptation of either as long as they are “fantasy.” The category of political utopianism is more akin to modern utopian theory, both of which attempt to affect social realities through envisioning and proposing a new social order. Political utopianism begins with Plato and includes Aristotle, Cicero and various Cynic and Stoic authors as well, especially Diogenes, Zeno, and Chrysippus.²

Dawson’s distinctions are helpful, but, given his primary interest in political utopianism, he largely ignores any distinguishing elements of what he calls folk utopianism. This study, therefore, nuances this category by suggesting two further distinctions: primitivistic utopianism and afterlife utopianism. Primitivistic utopias consist of the remote past (in the form of the Golden Age) and the distant present (in the form of idealized societies), what Lovejoy and Alexander call chronological primitivism and cultural primitivism respectively.³ Rather than grouping afterlife utopias together with the primitivistic utopias, they are significantly different enough to warrant their own category if for no other reason than

¹ Doyne Dawson, *Cities of the Gods: Communist Utopias in Greek Thought* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1992), 7. See also Mary Ann Beavis, *Jesus & Utopia: Looking for the Kingdom of God in the Roman World* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2006), 9–10.

² Plato is undoubtedly the quintessential example of political utopianism, but Dawson spends the majority of his work trying to show that Cynic and Stoic utopias, particularly Zeno’s *Republic* and Diogenes’ *Republic*, also belong in this tradition (Dawson, *Cities of the Gods*, 111–222). See also H. C. Baldry, “Zeno’s Ideal State,” *JHS* 79 (1959): 3–15; Nicola Festa, *I Frammenti degli Stoici Antichi* (Bari: Giuseppe Laterza e Figli, 1935).

³ Arthur O. Lovejoy and George Boas, *Primitivism and Related Ideas in Antiquity* (vol. 1 of *A Documentary History of Primitivism and Related Ideas*; ed. A. O. Lovejoy, G. Chinard, G. Boas, and R. S. Crane; Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1935), 1–22.

these utopias are only accessible after death and often without certain “hindrances” of a material body.⁴

In order to address ancient Greco-Roman utopias, this study comes at the subject from two directions. The first half of the chapter will introduce the primary evidence for Greco-Roman utopianism through the three categories of political utopianism, primitivistic utopianism, and afterlife utopianism. These categories are meant to give shape to a definition of utopianism as understood by an ancient Greek or Roman. These categories are not generic categories in that they do not define a genre of literature; instead, each houses a host of genres used to construct ancient utopian expectations. These categories represent three fundamental ways utopias are expressed in the ancient world. Political utopianism, therefore, expresses utopian expectations in terms of the intentional construction of a social order, primitivism in terms of ancient attitudes toward primitive cultures, and afterlife utopianism in terms of expectations about life after death. Thus the first half of the chapter will contain an explication of the categories through which one can make sense of the wide variety of works that are useful for reconstructing ancient Greco-Roman perspectives on utopianism.

The second half of the chapter will present a more detailed explanation of the expectations found in the three categories of utopianism by parsing out fourteen utopian *topoi* that are frequently found in these sources. For example, the presence of food that grows naturally without the aid of humans, an abundance of wine, a temperate climate, and a lack of war are all utopian expectations found throughout ancient Greco-Roman literature. These *topoi* represent the expectations that appear most frequently throughout Greco-Roman literature.

It is worth stating, however obvious it may be, that one should not expect to find complete uniformity in utopian expectations throughout all Greco-Roman literature. Some authors include elements that other authors do not, and occasionally authors describe utopia in terms that contradict expectations of other authors. Despite the lack of complete uniformity, however, there is surprising regularity with regard to the metaphors and images used to express a utopian environment. It is these metaphors that appear frequently throughout the literature that are of most interest to

⁴ We should expect, however, that these utopias are occasionally accessible before death if one knows the right paths (e.g. Homer, *Od.* 10.487–540; Virgil, *Aen.* 6) or through people who die and return to life (e.g. Plato's Myth of Er, *Resp.* 614A–621D).

this study. “Frequency” is a relative term, however, and so an appendix is included that maps out the most important works expressing utopian ideals, categorizing them under the three categories of utopian literature mentioned above and noting how often the specific *topoi* appear in the literature. With the aid of the appendix, the reader will be able to better judge the “frequency” of any given *topos*.⁵

2.2. THE CATEGORIES OF UTOPIAN EXPRESSION

It is necessary first to distinguish the sources that will provide the data for reconstructing ancient utopian expectations. The texts can be placed consistently into one of the following three categories: political utopianism, primitivistic utopianism, and afterlife utopianism.

2.2.1. *Political Utopianism*

Dawson divides political utopianism into “low” and “high” utopianism.⁶ Both categories contain descriptions of comprehensive reforms for establishing an ideal city-state. The primary factor that differentiates the two categories is whether or not these reforms were meant to be put into action. Low utopianism, called so because it is “a real and practical program,” can be seen in Plato’s *Laws*, Aristotle’s *Politics*, and a number of lesser known Aristotelians. Dawson claims that this tradition ends with Cicero’s *On the Republic* and *On the Laws*.⁷

High utopianism, on the other hand, was not meant to be enacted but instead served as a model for reform at the level of the community and the individual. It is best represented in Plato’s *Republic*. Book 9 of the *Republic* ends with Plato recognizing that his utopian city does not, and will likely never, exist in this world. Instead, he states, “perhaps this city is laid up in heaven, a pattern for the one who desires to see, and seeing, to dwell in it himself. It makes no difference, then, whether it exists or ever will. His existence will be an expression of this city alone, and of no other” (*Resp.* 592B).⁸ The establishment of such a city, then, is not the end

⁵ See Appendix A.

⁶ Dawson, *Cities of the Gods*, 7.

⁷ Dawson, *Cities of the Gods*, 7.

⁸ Translation mine. This famous saying of Plato is perhaps the well-spring of many later writers’ thoughts on the city of God, most notably Augustine (*City of God*) and Marcus Aurelius (*Meditations* 3.11; 4.23).

goal. Reflection and contemplation upon this city, however, will shape the conduct and nature of humans in such a way so as to conform them to the nature of this ideal city.⁹

The political utopianism of Plato et al. exists because of a larger world of influence. First, the influence of primitivism, which is described below, should not be underestimated. Descriptions of the Golden Age contain the seeds of political utopian expression in the form of vivid descriptions about what life should look like. These descriptions offer metaphors that some political utopists employ.¹⁰

Other sources of political utopianism might include the Pythagorean order of the late sixth century BCE that held a form of communism.¹¹ Dawson believes this order had a limited impact on Plato and Aristotle, but they perhaps provide a model for later utopists and were possibly the first to coin the phrase *koina ta ton philon*, "What belongs to friends is common property," a phrase popular among political utopists.¹²

One final influence that Dawson mentions is the city of Sparta and the "serious utopias" that begin to arise in the fifth century.¹³ It is certainly the case that Spartan communism and the sharing of property and goods became the model for the utopianism of Plato and Aristotle.¹⁴ Its military class, its oligarchy, and its founder and lawgiver, Lycurgus, all deeply influenced Plato, whose "mixed constitution" contains an extra helping of Spartan politics.

⁹ As Dawson puts it, "[Socrates'] purpose is not to prove that the best city can exist, but to find appropriate *paradeigmata*, models or patterns which we ought to imitate as closely as possible" (*Cities of the Gods*, 71).

¹⁰ Dawson unnecessarily derides the role of folk utopias stating, for example, "The legend of Cronus' time would provide serious utopists with a stock of metaphors, and nothing more than that. Cronus' time was an ancient myth, which the Greeks of the classical age did not confuse with reality" (*Cities of the Gods*, 14). On this point, it seems Dawson has underestimated the importance of such metaphors in understanding, organizing, and even creating reality. As Rhiannon Evans has recognized, folk utopias are more than just "repetitive examples of a universal trope. Their function is historically determined, and the evocation of Golden Age mythology is particularly important in harnessing the political and cultural potential of the utopian" (Rhiannon Evans, *Utopia Antiqua: Readings of the Golden Age and Decline at Rome* [London: Routledge, 2008], 3).

¹¹ Brent James Schmidt, *Utopian Communities of the Ancient World: Idealistic Experiments of Pythagoras, the Essenes, Pachomius, and Proclus* (Lewiston, NY: Edwin Mellen Press, 2010), 39–77.

¹² Dawson, *Cities of the Gods*, 14–18.

¹³ Dawson, *Cities of the Gods*, 21–37.

¹⁴ Schmidt, *Utopian Communities*, 17; cf. Isocrates, *Areop.* 35; Aristotle, *Pol.* 1263a29; 1320b9–11; Plato, *Resp.* 416D; Plutarch, *Lyc.* 8.3.

Concerning Stoic utopianism, we are faced with the problem of reconstructing works that are no longer extant. Zeno's *Republic*, for example, is referenced by a number of ancients, but we no longer possess any copies today. With the assistance of earlier scholarship of Baldry and Festa, Dawson helpfully delineates and translates twenty-two fragments that directly reference the stoic utopian ideal.¹⁵ The authors of these fragments are Diogenes Laertius, Sextus Empiricus, Philodemus of Gadara, Plutarch, and Athenaeus.¹⁶ These sources will be essential for the reconstruction of political utopianism in what follows.

It is likely that Zeno and perhaps later Stoics are responding directly to Plato's *Republic* and *Laws* and consider the two works to be part of a singular system, something Aristotle also does. Dawson notes that "[Zeno's] criticism of Plato was mostly intended to eliminate the lower utopianism, the desire for power and the mechanisms for rule, which Plato allowed to compromise his ideals."¹⁷ In this way, the Stoics appear to favor a higher utopianism as represented in Plato's *Republic*. Zeno appears to have created a world in which many of the public institutions that Plato retained are disbanded, including the military, temples, law courts, gymnasium, currency and education as traditionally envisioned by his peers. As a result, the Stoic utopia was more radical than that envisioned by Plato.

Diogenes the Cynic was also said to have produced a *Republic*, a claim met with much skepticism by modern scholarship. The first problem is that the few sources that do reference Diogenes' *Republic* differ on whether he even wrote such a work with some suggesting that someone else wrote it centuries later.¹⁸ Second, as Dawson argues, a utopianism as modeled by Plato, Aristotle, and even Zeno simply does not fit with the Cynic philosophy. Cynics had no interest in establishing a polis or even reforming it. They were far too individualistic for this. They did not likely wish to institutionalize their radical way of life as a way of life meant for

¹⁵ Dawson's twenty-two sources are an expansion of Baldry ("Zeno's Ideal State"), who only includes twelve fragments, but is not as extensive as Festa (*Stoici*) who has thirty-one. To both of these Dawson adds fragments from Philodemus' *On the Stoics*, the seventh chapter of which he claims "is about as useful a piece of evidence as anything" (*Cities of the Gods*, 214 n. 16).

¹⁶ Dawson, *Cities of the Gods*, 166–72. Dawson also cites Iambulus, though he states that he is "not really a 'source'" (172). It is thought that Iambulus might be drawing on Stoic utopian thought in his creation of the Island of the Sun (preserved in part in Diodorus Siculus 2.55–60), but these cannot be considered with the same weight as the sources mentioned above that clearly mention stoic philosophy.

¹⁷ Dawson, *Cities of the Gods*, 186.

¹⁸ Dawson, *Cities of the Gods*, 146–51.

all people. They were content to allow the polis to retain its power while acting as prophetic voices within the polis calling people to a better way of living. They lived as citizens of a larger community not bound by geography or ethnicity. When asked to which polis he belongs, Diogenes stated that he was a *kosmopolites*, a citizen of the world.¹⁹ Though it is unlikely that Diogenes constructed his own utopian *Republic*,²⁰ he nevertheless acts as a voice criticizing the polis in ways similar to a utopian critique of the polis without the positive, constructive elements. For this reason, Diogenes sounds similar to Zeno and Plato even though he is not rightly labeled a utopist.

The political utopian tradition, then, is primarily found in the works of Plato, Aristotle, and those writing about the *Republic* of Zeno. It is these works that will function as the source material for constructing the topography of utopia.

2.2.2. *Primitivistic Utopianism*

The seminal and most comprehensive study of primitivism in the ancient world is Arthur Lovejoy and George Boas, *Primitivism and Related Ideas in Antiquity*. In it the authors distinguish between two types of primitivism, chronological and cultural, two categories that remain helpful and will be used throughout.²¹ Chronological primitivism attempts to answer the question, At what point in time was the world and human existence in its best state? The answer: somewhere in the past. For Greco-Romans the primary myth for chronological primitivism is the myth of the Golden Age.

Cultural primitivism, as with chronological primitivism, also recognizes that the world is not as it should be. Instead of pointing to the distant past, however, as a way of answering the question, What should the world be like?, cultural primitivism points to remote cultures that have not been tainted by the “progress” of civilization. Remote locations such as the ends of the earth, islands, and tall mountains all become spaces in which culturally primitive societies can exist. For this reason, it is typical for stories of cultural primitivism to be told in travel narratives, particularly seafaring narratives where explorers discover uncharted territory or travel long

¹⁹ Diogenes Laertius, *Lives* 6.63, 72, 98.

²⁰ Dawson, *Cities of the Gods*, 151.

²¹ Lovejoy Boas, *Primitivism*, 1–22.

distances to remote places.²² This section will begin with a discussion of chronological primitivism, particularly as introduced by Hesiod, and move to cultural primitivism. It will conclude with the primitivist's notion of "nature" in order to further categorize the primitivistic worldview.

For the ancient Greeks, the idea of chronological primitivism can be traced at least as far back as Hesiod who distinguishes between various races of humanity, assigning metallic designations to each race.²³

Golden was the race of speech-endowed human beings which the immortals, who have their mansions on Olympus, made first of all. They lived at the time of Cronus, when he was king in the sky; just like gods they spent their lives, with a spirit free from care, entirely apart from toil and distress. Worthless old age did not oppress them, but they were always the same in their feet and hands, and delighted in festivities, lacking in all evils; and they died as if overpowered by sleep. They had all good things: the grain-giving field bore crops of its own accord, much and unstinting, and they themselves, willing, mild-mannered, shared out the fruits of their labors together with many good things, wealthy in sheep, dear to the blessed gods. (*Op.* 109–120 [Most, LCL])

For Hesiod's golden race, life is without sorrow, free of work, free of tiring, and filled with merriment and feasting. Even death is portrayed as peaceful.

Hesiod follows the golden race with the silver and bronze races. With each step down the scale of precious metals, the immorality in the world only increases. For example, the silver race is described as unable to "restrain themselves from wicked outrage... [not] willing to honor the immortals or to sacrifice upon the holy altars of the blessed ones, as is established right for human beings in each community" (*Op.* 134–137 [Most, LCL]). The bronze race "cared only for the painful works of Ares and for acts of violence" (145–146). Both races, therefore, are marked by war and strife between the gods and humans.

Hesiod's fourth age, however, is the race of heroes. He calls these heroes demigods and says that they were among those who fought in the

²² For example, Diodorus Siculus collects a number of stories of sea-voyages that discover wonderful islands in far off places (2.47; 2.55–60; 5.18–20; 5.42–46). Another example comes from Lucian who mocks these tales of wonder in his satirically titled *True Story*.

²³ As mentioned above, though Hesiod uses the terms golden race, silver race, etc., later writers historicize these periods and speak instead of ages. See Danielle Lecoq and Roland Schaer, "Ancient, Biblical, and Medieval Traditions," in *Utopia: The Search for the Ideal Society in the Western World* (ed. R. Schaer, G. Claeys, and L. T. Sargent; New York: Oxford University Press, 2000), 35.

Trojan War. Unlike the silver and bronze races, the heroes are said to dwell on the Islands of the Blessed after their death. Hesiod comments that “these dwell with a spirit free of care on the Islands of the Blessed beside deep-eddying Ocean—happy heroes, for whom the grain-giving field bears honey-sweet fruit flourishing three times a year” (*Op.* 170–173 [Most, LCL]). This description of their eternal resting place is notably similar to some of the characteristics of the golden race.

Finally, Hesiod describes a fifth race of humans, the present iron race, which is marked by toil, sorrow, and death. Because of this, Hesiod laments that he was not born in a different period.

Hesiod’s description of the ages is a form of chronological primitivism in which the present age is viewed as inferior to that which came before. This portrayal of world history is not one of steady decline, however, in that the age of the heroes acts as a hiccup in an otherwise worsening world. Nevertheless, as with all chronological primitivists, the present age is considered evil when compared to prior ages. Examples of this mindset can be found in all ages of Greek and Roman history as will become evident below in the section on the *topoi* of utopia.²⁴

The second form of primitivism mentioned by Lovejoy and Boas is cultural primitivism.²⁵ Cultural primitivism is the belief that advanced societies are plagued with issues of morality and degeneracy while those not affected by the advancement of the world are of higher moral caliber. Rather than looking to the primeval past as the place where good societies exist, however, cultural primitivism looks to remote societies in the present.²⁶ The following quotation from Strabo is exemplary: “And yet our mode of life has spread its change for the worse to almost all peoples, introducing amongst them luxury and sensual pleasures and, to satisfy these vices, base artifices that lead to innumerable acts of greed. So then, much wickedness has fallen on the barbarian peoples also, on the Nomads as well as the rest” (*Geog.* 7.3.7 [Jones, LCL]).²⁷ Strabo indicates

²⁴ For more chronological decline narratives see Homer, *Il.* 1.260–68; Hesiod, *Op.* 109–120; Aratus, *Phaen.* 96–136; Plato, *Pol.* 273c–d; Ovid, *Metam.* 1.76–215.

²⁵ Lovejoy and Boas, *Primitivism*, 7–11.

²⁶ Cultural primitivism, however, was matched by an equally pervasive tendency toward ethnocentrism in which a people (in this case, ancient Greco-Romans) view themselves as the center of progress and advancement. James Romm notes that the Greco-Romans oscillate between an ethnocentrism and its inverse. The latter is what this study is referring to as cultural primitivism. See Romm, *The Edges of the Earth in Ancient Thought: Geography, Exploration, and Fiction* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1992), 46.

²⁷ See Romm, *Edges of the Earth*, 47. Herodotus uses ethnocentrism as a way of painting an opponent with a negative hue. For example, of the Persians he says, “They honour

that Rome, rather than being an example of virtue, compromises the virtue of all cultures with which it has contact.

To further distinguish between types of cultural primitivisms, Lovejoy and Boas have coined the terms *hard* and *soft primitivism*.²⁸ Soft primitivism is often characterized by some of the following elements: soil that naturally grows its own food without need for agricultural skill, weather that is unnaturally temperate year round, and societies that have never seen war or strife of any kind.²⁹ In this way, soft primitivism presses the boundaries between reality and fiction. For example, when Iambulus describes an island that produces food without need for work, on which the people live unusually long lives, and on which there is no strife of any kind, he is certainly in the realm of soft primitivism.³⁰

Hard primitivism, on the other hand, embraces the difficulties that a primitive lifestyle brings and holds these “noble savages” as virtuous despite, or perhaps because of, the hardships they face.³¹ The people who live under the conditions of hard primitivism are exalted as people who have not been “softened” by the luxuries of civilization and are capable of living simple lives without such amenities as clothes to keep warm in the winter or home for protection from the elements. These groups are held as exemplary particularly among Cynics and Stoics who value simplicity. Examples of hard primitivism are prevalent in the ancient

most of all those who dwell nearest them, next those who are next farthest removed, and so going ever onwards they assign hour by this rule; those who dwell farthest off they hold least honourable of all; for they deem themselves to be in all regards by far the best of all men, the rest to have but a proportionate claim to merit, till those who dwell farthest away have least merit of all” (*Hist.* 1.134 [Godley, LCL]). It is this hubris represented in ethnocentrism, however, that Herodotus says ultimately results in their demise. Cf. Romm, *The Edges of the Earth*, 55.

²⁸ Lovejoy and Boas, *Primitivism*, 10–11. As Romm has suggested, however, Lovejoy and Boas have “overstated the ‘profound opposition’ between these two poles.” Instead, hard and soft primitivism should be seen as two sides of the same coin (Romm, *Edges of the Earth*, 68, n. 52).

²⁹ It should be noted that Lovejoy and Boas state that the people of the Golden Age were soft primitives, and suggest that all chronological primitivism can be understood as soft primitivism. In this way, the category of soft primitivism is a category that encompasses some cultural primitivism and all chronological primitivism (*Primitivism*, 10).

³⁰ Diodorus Siculus, 2.54–60.

³¹ The term “noble savage” has a lengthy and contested history. See Ter Ellingson, *The Myth of the Noble Savage* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2001), xiii–xxii. Cf. Rhiannon Evans, *Utopia Antiqua*, 78, especially n. 42; Lovejoy and Boas, *Primitivism*, 287–367; John Ferguson, *Utopias of the Classical World* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1975), 16–22; Gaile McGregor, *The Noble Savage and the New World Garden: Notes Towards a Syntactics of Place* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1988).

world.³² Pompeius Trogus, a first-century BCE writer, has the following to say about the Scythians, a unique community that fits the model of hard primitivism:

The people [of Scythia] have no landmarks, for they neither cultivate the soil, nor have they any house, dwelling, or settled place of abode, but are always engaged in feeding herds and flocks, and wandering through uncultivated deserts. They carry their wives and children with them in wagons, which, as they are covered with hides against the rain and cold, they use instead of houses. Justice is observed among them, more from the temper of the people, than from the influence of laws. No crime in their opinion is more heinous than theft; for, among people that keep their flocks and herds without fence or shelter in the woods, what would be safe, if stealing were permitted? Gold and silver they despise, as much as other men covet them. They live on milk and honey. The use of wool and clothes is unknown among them, although they are pinched by perpetual cold; they wear, however, the skins of wild animals, great and small. Such abstemiousness has caused justice to be observed among them, as they covet nothing belonging to their neighbours; for it is only where riches are of use, that the desire of them prevails. And would that other men had like temperance, and like freedom from desire for the goods of others! There would then assuredly be fewer wars in all ages and countries, and the sword would not destroy more than the natural course of destiny. And it appears extremely wonderful, that nature should grant that to them which the Greeks cannot attain by long instruction from their wise men and the precepts of their philosophers; and that cultivated morals should have the disadvantage in a comparison with those of unpolished barbarians. So much better effect has the ignorance of vice in the one people than the knowledge of virtue in the other. (Justin, *Hist. Phil. Epit.* 2.2 [Watson])

In this description, one recognizes the harsh realities of this primitivistic group—they have no houses or shelter, and they are not impervious to rain and cold. Soft primitivistic descriptions do not contain these harsher realities. Nevertheless, the Scythians are clearly portrayed positively throughout.

Lovejoy and Boas rightly note that a common thread that ties together certain philosophical underpinnings is that the primitivistic life (particularly hard primitivism) is more “natural” than the civilized life. In fact, the Greek word φύσις is regularly used by ancient authors as a positive description of primitive societies. What is *natural*, then, is perceived as virtuous and normative. It is worth stopping to ask, What do ancients consider to be *natural*? Lovejoy and Boas helpfully note the following five categories

³² Lovejoy and Boas, *Primitivism*, 289–90, 315–44.

that frame how ancients might define being in a state of nature.³³ Many of these can be found in the passage from Pompeius Trogus above, and one should certainly not expect all primitivists, much less all ancients, to hold all of these beliefs. These are meant to give the reader categories for “states of nature” as often found in ancient, primitivistic writings.

1. Temporal state of nature: older is better, which is the essence of chronological primitivism.³⁴ 2. Technological: life that is free from intellectual advancements—whether agricultural, metallurgical, nautical, or otherwise—or any other mark of civilization is preferred.³⁵ 3. Economic: economic communism is the ideal (especially the sharing of land); private

³³ Lovejoy and Boas, *Primitivism*, 14–15. Lovejoy and Boas suggest seven categories, two of which are not here offered: juristic and ethical states of nature. In the research, this study was unable to corroborate these two categories. While they are occasionally found in the primary sources, they did not appear with nearly as much regularity as the other categories mentioned. The juristic state of nature concerns the role of government and laws. Presumably for primitivists, the only government necessary is that which is found within the family or, at most, the clan. Lovejoy and Boas, however, note that it is typically anti-primitivists who are concerned with the juristic category: “Writers chiefly interested in political theory are likely, of course, to consider only the juristic state of nature; and that conception has had a development more or less independent of the others, and largely, though by no means exclusively, at the hands of anti-primitivistic theorists. The state of nature is for these writers a condition for the intolerable evils of which the civil state is the necessary remedy” (*Primitivism*, 15). For this reason, this category is not apt for the descriptions of primitivism at which we will be looking.

An ethical state of nature is somewhat more complex. Lovejoy and Boas define it as follows: “the control of human life by so-called ‘natural’—which does not, in this connection, always imply egoistic or purely sensuous—impulses, without deliberate and self-conscious moral effort, the constraint of rules, or the sense of sin: man in unity with himself, with no ‘civil war in the cave’ ” (*Primitivism*, 15). They later go on to say that this should not necessarily be tied with a belief in the “natural goodness of humankind,” and in fact, most primitivists believe quite the opposite. A doctrine of “the fall” is amenable to a chronological primitivism that says at one point in history the world was good, but somewhere along the way things went astray (*Primitivism*, 17). Whether one is looking at Herodotus’ description of the ages of humankind or Genesis’ account of Adam and Eve, both would have been understood by primitivists as offering an answer to the question: How did evil enter the world? This appears to be a critical question primitivists are attempting to answer. They recognize that the world is not as it should be and are offering solutions for why that is so. Nevertheless, because of the lack of clarity in Lovejoy and Boas’ category of the ethical state of nature, it is not used here.

³⁴ As has already been stated, the myth of the Golden Age is the primary way in which this idea is advanced. Examples are unnecessary given how common this myth is throughout ancient times.

³⁵ For anti-technology in the ancient world, see the discussion under the *topos* “War and Peace” below. See also Aeschylus, *frag.* 196; *Prom.* 436–506; Aratus, *Phaen.* 110–113; Lucretius, *De Rerum Natura* 5.933–936, 1002–1006, 1448–1457; Ovid, *Am.* 3.8.39–40; *Metam.* 1.94–96; Ps.-Seneca, *Octavia* 406–416; Strabo, *Geog.* 11.4.3; Tibullus, *Elegies* 1.3.35–48; Virgil, *Aen.* 8.313–318.

wealth leads to society's degeneration.³⁶ 4. Marital: there is some variety here, but for many, the *natural* relationship between men and women was one where men shared both wives and children; in its most extreme forms, it includes complete sexual promiscuity.³⁷ 5. Dietetic: vegetarianism is the ideal. The avoidance of bloodshed is preferable, which makes the gathering of nuts and fruits a popular trope in primitivistic writings.³⁸ In some cases, as above, animals that are wild are "fair game." For some ancients, such as Ovid, vegetarianism is linked to an understanding of reincarnation in which humans might be reincarnated into animal life.³⁹

The emphasis on living "naturally" is found in both cultural and chronological primitivism and, subsequently, hard and soft primitivism. As we investigate the shared *topoi* of utopia below, the reader would do well to have these categories in mind.

2.2.3. *Afterlife Utopianism*

It is impossible to talk about *the* Greco-Roman view of the afterlife. Greeks and Romans had a variety of opinions on what happens after death.⁴⁰

³⁶ For examples, see Caesar, *Bell. gall.* 6.22; Diodorus Siculus, 5.45.5; Horace, *Carm.* 2.15; Lucian, *Sat.* 2.21, 31; Ovid, *Am.* 3.8.39–44; *Metam.* 1.132–36; Ps.-Seneca, *Octavia* 400–406; Tacitus, *Germ.* 26.

³⁷ See below under the *topos* "Wealth" for a discussion of communism and the sharing of wives and children. Examples include Agatharchides, *Id.* 51; Diodorus Siculus, 2.58.1; Diogenes Laertius, *Lives* 6.72, 7.33–34; Herodotus, *Hist.* 1.216; Lucian, *Ver. hist.* 2.19; Sextus Empiricus, *Pyr.* 3.205; Strabo, *Geog.* 7.3.7, 7.3.9; Tibullus, *Elegies* 1.3.63–66; 2.3.63–74.

³⁸ Juvenal, *Sat.* 6.1–24, 13.28–59; Lucretius, *De Rerum Natura* 5.933–944; Tibullus, *Elegies* 2.3.72–73; Varro, *Rust.* 2.1.4. Lovejoy and Boas say that the phrase ἄλις δρυός (Enough of the oak-tree!) was a popular phrase in the ancient world that "was used by primitive man when he grew tired of eating acorns and turned to the cultivated fruits of Demeter" (*Primitivism*, 95, n. 159; see Dicaearchus in Porphyry, *Abst.* 4.2; Cicero, *Ep.* 2.19.1; Diogenianus, 1.62, 190; Apostolius, 2.42, 275).

³⁹ See Ovid, *Metam.* 15.75–175.

⁴⁰ The bibliography is extensive, and the following is only a sampling. For bibliography, see Marlene Herfort-Koch, *Tod, Totenfürsorge und Jenseitsvorstellungen in der griechischen Antike. Eine Bibliographie* (Quellen und Forschungen zur Antiken Welt 9; München: Tuduv), 1992. For an introduction to the issues, see Erwin Rohde, *Psyche: The Cult of Souls and Belief in Immortality among the Greeks* (2 vols.; tr. W. Hillis; New York: Harper & Row, 1966); W. F. Jackson Knight, *Elysion: On Ancient Greek and Roman Beliefs Concerning a Life after Death* (New York: Barnes & Noble, 1970); Robert Garland, *The Greek Way of Death* (2d ed.; Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2001); Alan E. Bernstein, *The Formation of Hell: Death and Retribution in the Ancient and Early Christian Worlds* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1993); Christiane Sourvinou-Inwood, 'Reading' Greek Death: to the End of the Classical Period (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996); J. Edward Wright, *The Early History of Heaven* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000); Alan F. Segal, *Life after Death: A History of the Afterlife in the Religions of the West* (New York: Doubleday, 2004); Lars Albinus, *The*

Homer tells of shades living in Hades; Plato speaks of the transmigration of the soul; any number of authors speak of an Island of the Blessed or the Elysian Fields, though many of those authors differ on who ends up there; and many Greeks and Romans denied an afterlife altogether.⁴¹ What follows, then, is a brief survey of Greco-Roman beliefs concerning the afterlife beginning with Homer and ending with Virgil.

In Homer, the afterlife is typically described as a bleak, “mirthless place” (*Il.* 11.94).⁴² After one dies, he or she is led into Hades where one lives a shadow of the existence he or she lived while on earth. It is not an overstatement, therefore, to suggest that early Greeks believed that one’s earthly existence is where life happens after which one can expect a dreary state of non-existence. An oft-quoted example comes from the *Odyssey* where the deceased shade of Achilles says to Odysseus, “Never try to reconcile me to death, glorious Odysseus. I should choose, so I might live on earth, to serve as the hireling of another, some landless man with hardly enough to live on, rather than to be lord over all the dead that have perished” (11.488–491 [Murray, LCL]). For early Greeks, then, death is not something to which one looks forward, but it is nevertheless a natural phenomenon all experience regardless of political rank, wealth, or even virtue.⁴³ All people die. Even Heracles, the child of Zeus, dies and goes to Hades.⁴⁴ It is *this* life that matters, because the next life is hardly to be considered “life” at all.

House of Hades: Studies in Ancient Greek Eschatology (SR 2; Aarhus: Aarhus University Press, 2000).

⁴¹ There are a plethora of examples of the denial of an afterlife in the form of grave-stone inscriptions, most commonly *non fui, fui, non sum, non curo*, or “I was not, I was, I am not, I don’t care” (Segal, *Life after Death*, 223). Or another inscription reads, “In Hades there is no boat, no Charon, no Aeacus who holds the keys, no Cerberus. All of us, whom death has taken away are rotten bones and ashes; nothing more” (CIL., vi, 14672=Ins. Graec., xiv, 1746, quoted in Clifford Herschel Moore, *Pagan Ideas of Immortality during the Early Roman Empire* [Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1918], 26–27).

⁴² Jan N. Bremmer, *The Rise and Fall of the Afterlife* (London: Routledge, 2002), 4–5.

⁴³ Bernstein (*The Formation of Hell*) places Homer and Hesiod (and strangely the Orphics) in a chapter entitled “neutral death.” He states that these authors share “with the Babylonian texts a view of death as neutral, embracing all the dead in nearly the same conditions, chiefly marked by strict separation from the living” (21). Though his use of the term “neutral” is ambiguous, from the context of the sentence quoted above, it appears that he means that death does not distinguish between rich and poor, righteous and unrighteous, patriotic and treasonous, or any other distinction. All people die, and all go to Hades.

⁴⁴ Bremmer, *Rise and Fall*, 5; cf. Christiane Sourvinou-Inwood, “To Die and Enter the House of Hades: Homer, Before and After,” in *Mirrors of Mortality: Studies in the Social History of Death* (ed. J. Whaley; London: Europa, 1981), 20.

Despite the generalized picture of Hades as a place for all the dead, even by the time of Homer one finds the seeds of the possibility of a blessed afterlife, though for a very small group of people. In the *Odyssey*, Menelaus enters into an afterlife that is different from that of all other humans:

But for yourself, Menelaus, fostered by Zeus, it is not ordained that you should die and meet fate in the horse-pasturing Argos, but to the Elysian plain and the ends of the earth will the immortals convey you, where dwells fair-haired Rhadamanthus, and where life is easiest for men. No snow is there, nor heavy storm, nor ever rain, but always Ocean sends up blasts of the shrill-blowing West Wind that they may give cooling to men. (4.561–568 [Murray, LCL])

Despite Menelaus' fortune, among early Greek writers he is the exception to the rule. Homer does not specifically mention any other humans who enter the Elysian plains. It is not until later Greek authors, particularly around the fifth century BCE, who extend this tradition about Menelaus and suggest his fate is normative for a larger population. Menelaus becomes a springboard in the development of the Greco-Roman afterlife.

Hesiod provides another account of a blessed afterlife, but, as with Homer, it is limited to a small cross-section of a by-gone generation. He states that it is only for

the godly race of men-heroes, who are called the demigods, the generation before our own. . . . There the end of death shrouded some of them, but upon others Zeus the father, Cronus' son, bestowed life and habitations far from human beings and settled them at the limits of the earth; and these dwell with a spirit free of care on the Islands of the Blessed beside deep-eddying Ocean—happy heroes, for whom the grain-giving field bears honey-sweet fruit flourishing three times a year. (*Op.* 159–160; 166–173 [Most, LCL])⁴⁵

For both Homer and Hesiod, then, the average person was destined for a shadowy existence in Hades. If a blessed afterlife existed at all, it was meant only for heroes or great men of old.

As early as the sixth and into the fifth centuries BCE, the landscape of the afterlife began to change dramatically. Archaeological evidence shows

⁴⁵ One might notice that Hesiod speaks of a "golden *race*" rather than a Golden *Age*. Concerning this, Lecoq and Schaer rightly state the following: "Destined to recall the happiness of the community first allied with the divine order, before the world started going 'backwards,' the myth of the golden race was transformed into a metaphor and also historicized, so that the theme of the Golden Age gradually supplanted that of the golden *race*" ("Ancient, Biblical, and Medieval Traditions," 35).

that it is during the fifth century that the dead begin to be buried with an obol meant for Charon, the ferryman at the river Styx.⁴⁶ Jan Bremmer has argued that the development of the myth of Charon, which appears no earlier than the epic of *Minyas* in the sixth century BCE, “implies that the world of the dead was mentally dissociated from the living: death had apparently become less natural, less easy to tolerate. At the same time, a guide is also someone who knows the way: the need for a reassuring, knowing person is therefore also a sign of a growing anxiety about one’s own fate after death.”⁴⁷ Bremmer’s point is that a shift occurs from the time of Homer to the fifth century BCE, a shift that suggests an increased interest in what happens upon death. Bremmer’s argument is supported by a growing interest in the afterlife that occurs around this same time period in the form of Orphism and Pythagoreanism.

Orphism and Pythagoreanism democratize the afterlife. For these believers, entrance into the realm of a blessed afterlife is something available to all people no matter their class or age. But entrance into this world was not without cost. Orphic and Pythagorean followers were required to live a “puritanical” lifestyle and were ascetics who deprecated corporality.⁴⁸ With Orphism and Pythagoreanism comes thoughtful reflection on the nature of the soul in general and the reincarnation of the soul in particular.⁴⁹ Such reflection lays the groundwork for the great philosopher Plato whose reflections on the soul and the afterlife come to have an enormous influence throughout the Mediterranean world.⁵⁰

⁴⁶ Cf. Susan T. Stevens, “Charon’s Obol and Other Coins in Ancient Funerary Practice,” *Phoenix* 45 (1991): 215–29. Though the practice of “Charon’s Obol” is found from the fifth-century BCE to the second-century CE, archaeological evidence suggest that very few people were practicing it in the fifth century BCE, but the practice’s popularity increases from that point forward.

⁴⁷ Bremmer, *Rise and Fall*, 5.

⁴⁸ See Jan N. Bremmer, “Rationalization and Disenchantment in Ancient Greece: Max Weber among the Pythagoreans and Orphics?,” in *From Myth to Reason: Studies in the Development of Greek Thought* (ed. R. Buxton; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999), 71–83; E. R. Dodds, *The Greeks and the Irrational* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1951), 135–78.

⁴⁹ Bremmer (*Rise and Fall*, 11–26) argues that we have the Pythagoreans to thank for giving us the first reflections on the soul or the *psyche*.

⁵⁰ The literature on Orphism is enormous and continues to grow as more archaeological and epigraphic discoveries are made. An excellent introduction is still W. K. Guthrie, *Orpheus and Greek Religion: A Study in the Orphic Movement* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1952). For more recent bibliography, see Alberto Bernabé and Ana Isabel Jiménez San Cristóbal, *Instructions for the Netherworld: The Orphic Gold Tablets* (Religions in the Graeco-Roman World; tr. M. Chase; Leiden: Brill, 2007); Fritz Graf and Sarah Iles

During the fifth century BCE, the belief that the blessed afterlife is available to all people became increasingly popular with the spread of mystery religions.⁵¹ And yet despite the increase in popularity over all matters concerning the afterlife, this is not to say that the general public would have believed in such an afterlife. Instead, at least among the Athenian public of the late fifth century, the literary evidence suggests that the average Athenian would have believed more like Homer and less like the Pythagoreans regarding the prospect of reward and punishment in the afterlife. As Bremmer states, "We can confidently state that in tragedy Orphic and Pythagorean views of the underworld are conspicuously absent."⁵²

Though ideas such as the celestial dwelling place of the afterlife and the punishment of the unrighteous can be first found in the Pythagoreans,⁵³ it is through Plato that these ideas are popularized. Plato changes the discussion of the afterlife in a way that is almost unrecognizable to those who came before him.⁵⁴ As Alan Segal puts it,

Immortality or the lack of it in myth was always linked to the performance of heroic, cultic, or ritual actions in society. It was sought or denied as part of a hero's quest. . . . But this is the first time in history that it is explicitly linked with a mental act. What Plato called "recollection" includes a great many mental processes which we in English might call discovery, reasoning, and logical analysis.⁵⁵

Segal goes on to say that the difference between Plato and Homer, then, is that for Homer, Odysseus' goal was fame, military heroism, and political

Johnston, *Ritual Texts for the Afterlife: Orpheus and the Bacchic Gold Tablets* (New York: Routledge, 2007).

⁵¹ Wright, *Early History of Heaven*, 115–16.

⁵² *Rise and Fall*, 7; cf. Kenneth James Dover, *Greek Popular Morality in the Time of Plato and Aristotle* (Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing Company, 1974), 261–68; Kurt Treu, "Der Tod in der attischen Neuen Komödie," *JAC* 9 (1982): 21–29; Jon D. Mikalson, *Honor Thy Gods: Popular Religion in Greek Tragedy* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1994), 114–21.

⁵³ Bremmer, *Rise and Fall*, 7.

⁵⁴ Interestingly, though, Plato does not disconnect himself from the tradition that preceded him, he transforms it. For example, at one point in his *Republic* he appeals to Hesiod's description of the golden race of men who Hesiod says after their death become "fine spirits (δαίμονες) upon the earth, guardians of mortal human beings" (*Op.* 122–123 [Most, LCL]). Plato argues that the honorable of this present age should also be considered part of the golden race and, therefore, also share the fate of the golden race becoming daemons or spirits (*Resp.* 468E–469A). By doing so, Plato effectively uses Hesiod as an argument for the doctrine of the transmigration of the soul, the location of the blessed afterlife in the heavens, and a more inclusive population of the blessed afterlife, none of which the "historical Hesiod" would have believed.

⁵⁵ Segal, *Life after Death*, 228.

peace, no matter what the cost, but for Plato, the one seeking immortality would have to “promote moderation in behavior, deportment, and ethics—an enormous change from the life that Odysseus lived.”⁵⁶ This turn to the intellectual life, contemplation, and meditation served to change the discussion on the afterlife and how one should prepare for it.

Along with this turn to the intellect and emphasis on the immortality of the soul came a change in the location of the blessed afterlife. Since Plato exalted the soul and denigrated the corporeal, his afterlife took on a different form than that which came before him. Prior to Plato, Hades was thought of as the resting place of the dead, though some distinguished between lives of torment and lives of bliss. The Elysian Fields and the Islands of the Blessed were typically thought to be part of the underworld or sometimes at the edges of the terrestrial level. For Plato, the elevation of the soul created a need to spiritualize the afterlife. Though he is also capable of using the Elysian Fields and the Islands of the Blessed as places meant for those who are judged righteous, his cosmology favors a heavenly location for the blessed afterlife. In the myth of Er (book 10 of the *Republic*), Plato reserves the underworld and Tartarus for the unrighteous where they will serve a thousand years of punishment.⁵⁷ But for the righteous, a heavenly, celestial world awaits.⁵⁸

It should not go without mention that by the time of Plato, there is a clear expectation that judgment will occur in the afterlife. This was not always the case. Also, Plato’s afterlife was thought to be equitable; the righteous will receive their just reward in the same way the unrighteous will be given due punishment. This, of course, contrasts with Homer’s afterlife schema in which the righteous and unrighteous (on the whole) have similar fates in Hades.

In the first century BCE, Cicero is able to pronounce,

But, [Scipio] Africanus, be assured of this, so that you may be even more eager to defend the commonwealth: all those who have preserved, aided, or enlarged their fatherland have a special place prepared for them in the heavens, where they may enjoy an eternal life of happiness. . . .

Strive on indeed, and be sure that it is not you that is mortal, but only your body. For that man whom your outward form reveals is not yourself; the spirit is the true self, not that physical figure which can be pointed out by the finger. (*Resp.* 6.13, 26 [Keyes, LCL])

⁵⁶ Segal, *Life after Death*, 230.

⁵⁷ *Resp.*, 615A.

⁵⁸ *Resp.*, 614C. See also Plato, *Gorg.* 523A–527E; *Tim.* 41D–42D.

Cicero understands the soul to be immortal and to be free from the body upon death at which point it is raised to a heavenly place. By this point Platonism had become widespread, and here Cicero seems to be echoing the thoughts of Plato.

Finally, Virgil's influence on afterlife beliefs was felt throughout the Roman Empire. Virgil, a Roman citizen, weaves together Greek thought and dresses it in the garb of Roman nationalism. In particular, he writes with a Homeric cosmology, but his afterlife clearly evidences the influence of Plato. As with Plato and so many thinkers after him, a key expectation of the afterlife is Rhadamanthus, that is to say, the expectation of judgment. Following the righteous judgments of the figure Rhadamanthus, the wicked will go to a place of torment, and the virtuous will find themselves in a state of bliss. Segal states it well: "Intellectually, Virgil's justification for adding judgment to Homer's Hades is Platonic thought. Once there is a self-conscious self who must achieve the beatific vision through its own actions, there can be a place of punishment as well as a place of reward. . . . In Virgil's Hades, no one speaks Homeric Achilles' lines of envy for the living."⁵⁹ The difference between Virgil and Plato, however, is of no small significance. Whereas Plato emphasized the shaping of the intellect in preparation for a bodiless afterlife, Virgil emphasizes duty to the state as the key objective.

It should be clear from the survey of Greco-Roman afterlife expectations that not all Greco-Roman texts about the afterlife will contain descriptions of a utopian destination. Especially in the works of Homer and Hesiod, one should not expect to find reward and punishment in the afterlife, but instead a grim, shadowy place where all deceased souls are found.⁶⁰ Nevertheless, ancients frequently reinterpreted these traditional works placing an emphasis on matters that Hesiod or Homer may have had little interest and reading these texts in light of their own beliefs and philosophies.

2.3. THE *TOPOI* OF GRECO-ROMAN UTOPIAS

Because there are no extant lists from the ancient world stating what motifs should and should not be addressed when speaking of the good

⁵⁹ Segal, *Life after Death*, 244.

⁶⁰ Despite Homer and Hesiod's non-utopian afterlife, this study still heavily relies on them as they often are the provenance of imagery that gets repeated over and over throughout Greco-Roman literature, often in the form of primitivism.

life, what is constructed below is an etic account of utopian motifs that appear repeatedly throughout utopian descriptions from the ancient Greco-Roman world. The construct is meant to give space for elaboration on fourteen themes and ideas—what we are calling *topoi*—that appear frequently in descriptions of utopia, often with repeated terminology. In order to account for the frequency of a given *topos*, the appendix contains a list of the utopian passages, their categorical distinction, and the *topoi* that they employ (see Appendix A). Due to the large number of primary sources represented in what follows, the appendix is meant to act as a means of organizing the results of each *topos*.

2.3.1. *Setting*

There are two possibilities for the setting of utopia: rural and urban. The three categorical distinctions of utopianism above are helpful since afterlife and primitivistic utopianism overwhelmingly favor a rural setting while political utopianism, perhaps for obvious reasons, is mostly interested in urban life. We will begin with primitivistic and afterlife utopias and then move to political utopias.

2.3.1.1. *Rural Utopias*

From the time of Homer and Hesiod we find afterlife utopias expressed in the forms of the Island of the Blessed and the Elysian Fields, both rural. These two places are used throughout Greco-Roman lore as a way of naming and describing the space of the afterlife. Virgil, for example, chooses to speak of Elysium. When Aeneas travels to Hades he describes the place of the blessed afterlife as “a land of joy, the pleasant lawns and happy seats of the Blissful Groves” (*Aen.* 6.637–639 [Fairclough, LCL]). Even Plato, whose writings contain the most profound ancient musings on urban utopianism, uses rural spaces as metaphors or myths to speak about what happens upon death.⁶¹ In Greco-Roman literature through the first two centuries of the common era, there is only one example of an afterlife in which a city is explicitly mentioned, Lucian’s Island of the Blessed. Lucian, writing at the end of the 2nd century CE, incorporates two traditions into his Island of the Blessed: the city and the Elysian Fields (*Ver. hist.*, 2.5–29). After a series of fantastical events, Lucian and his crew sail to the island where they are “taken into the city and to the table of the blessed,” the

⁶¹ *Resp.* 614D, E; *Gorg.* 524A.

latter of which is located in the Elysian Fields. He describes both the city and the table/Elysian fields in great detail.

It is quite possible that Lucian is here drawing on the only primitivistic utopia in which one finds a city, i.e. Euhemerus' Panchea (Diodorus Siculus, 5.42.1–46.7; 6.1.4–10). Though Lucian does not mention Euhemerus explicitly, he does mention Ctesias and Iambulus, two authors whose fantastical writings parallel Euhemerus' (*Ver. hist.* 1.3). Unlike Lucian who goes into great detail about the city on the Island of the Blessed, however, Euhemerus does not describe the city on Panchea at all but instead quickly moves to a fuller description of the rural landscape beyond the city. Despite the examples of Lucian and Euhemerus, utopia is typically found in a rural setting.

The importance of island life as a space for utopia is something that can be traced throughout Greco-Roman writings and is found in afterlife utopias and primitivistic utopias. For example, according to Hecataeus, the Hyperboreans live on an island just north of the Celts, as far north as one can get.⁶² In the opposite direction, Iambulus tells of an extraordinary island, called the Island of the Sun, which is clearly a utopian space that includes many of the *topoi* discussed below and is located as far south as one can go, beyond the Ethiopians and Arabia the Blest.⁶³ Diodorus Siculus tells of another island located in the west, beyond the Pillars of Hercules and deep off the coast of Libya, that also exhibits many of the utopian *topoi* below.⁶⁴ The Islands of the Blessed are also traditionally located in the far west, at the ends of the earth.⁶⁵ With the exception of Lucian and Euhemerus' cities, these island utopias are all rural in setting, a point consistent with the "natural" ideals of primitivism.⁶⁶

Rhiannon Evans notes that "locations of desire in Greco-Roman antiquity are . . . isolated, often as islands, always situated on the periphery: as Herodotus noted, 'the most beautiful regions of the world are the furthest'

⁶² Diodorus Siculus, 2.47.1–2. Diskin Clay and Andrea Purvis, *Four Island Utopias* (The Focus Classical Library; Newburyport, Mass.: Focus Publishing, 1999), 167.

⁶³ Diodorus Siculus, 2.55.1–60.3. In an area close by is Euhemerus' island of Panchea, which is also an island space for utopia. For Ethiopia as "the ends of the earth" at the "banks of Oceanus," see Strabo (*Geog.* 1.1.6) who appeals to the authority of Homer (*Od.* 1.23; *Il.* 1.423). Cf. Clay and Purvis, *Four Island Utopias*, 168–73.

⁶⁴ Diodorus Siculus, 5.19.1–5.

⁶⁵ There are many examples of this, see for example Strabo, *Geog.* 3.2.13.

⁶⁶ Another island utopia worth mentioning is Plato's Atlantis, the story of which can be found in *Critias* and *Timaeus*. This island society, however, is more likely a mixture of primitivism and political utopianism in that it is a reflection upon Plato's *Republic*.

(3.106).⁶⁷ The remoteness of utopia, whether temporal or spatial, is central to the *topos* of setting. For temporal remoteness, utopia is often located in the distant past or the (presently) inaccessible future—the Golden Age or the afterlife. Or, if utopia is a present reality, it is equally inaccessible to the average person given that it is located at the ends of the earth where one must risk life and limb to find it.⁶⁸

Primarily, the remoteness of utopia serves to protect it from the corruptive forces of other, less “natural,” societies. Utopia’s remoteness is further protected by the absence of nautical technology, a (positive) deficiency that keeps its citizens from contacting other societies.⁶⁹ The following from Strabo is indicative of this attitude: “For as the result of taking up a seafaring life they not only have become morally worse, indulging in the practice of piracy and of slaying strangers, but also, because of their intercourse with many peoples, have partaken of the luxury and the peddling habits of those peoples” (*Geog.* 7.3.7 [Jones, LCL]). Furthermore, trade is often said to be non-existent or limited to a great degree.⁷⁰ Ferguson argues that by creating a society that is self-sufficient and not dependent on other societies, it allows that society to retain its “internal integrity.” Regarding Euhemerus’ primitivistic utopia, Ferguson states, “Panchaia is static: it is perfect, and any change from without would be a change for the worse.”⁷¹ Important to these primitive societies is not being able to leave the islands for lack of nautical technology and not having contact with outside cultures for lack of trade, both of which keeps the islanders safe from the influences of corruptive forces, preserving their “natural” state.

In his description of agriculture in the Greco-Roman world, Varro sets forth two possible ways of life for ancients—the country life and the city life. He argues for the superiority of country living. This should come as no surprise since he is a farmer dependent on the land. It is his reasoning, however, that is most interesting:

⁶⁷ Evans, *Utopia Antiqua*, 14.

⁶⁸ See also H. C. Baldry who remarks on the remoteness of utopia (“Who Invented the Golden Age?” *CQ*, New Series 2 [1952]: 83).

⁶⁹ See the extended discussion below on nautical technology under the *topos* “War and Peace.”

⁷⁰ For example, Euhemerus’ island of Panchea is strictly forbidden from exporting its mineral resources, though frankincense and myrrh are allowed to be exported (Diodorus Siculus, 5.42.2; 5.46.4–5).

⁷¹ Ferguson, *Utopias*, 107–108.

Though there are traditionally two ways in which men live—one in the country, the other in the city—there is clearly no doubt, Pinnius, that these differ not merely in the matter of place but also in the time at which each had its beginning. Country life is much more ancient—I mean the time when people lived on the land and had no cities. . . . And no marvel, since it was divine nature which gave us the country, and man's skill that built the cities; since all arts are said to have been discovered in Greece within a thousand years, while there never was a time when there were not fields on earth that could be tilled. And not only is the tilling of the fields more ancient—it is more noble. It was therefore not without reason that our ancestors tried to entice their citizens back from the city to the country; for in time of peace they were fed by the country Romans, and in time of war aided by them. It was also not without reason that they called the same earth “mother” and “Ceres,” and thought that those who tilled her lived a pious and useful life, and that they were the only survivors of the stock of King Saturnus. (*Rust.* 3.1.1, 4–5 [Hooper and Ash, LCL])

In the last line of this quotation, Varro connects the way of the countryman with the ancient past, especially the Golden Age. The mention of King Saturnus is a reference to the Golden Age during which time Saturn was king. This kind of chronological primitivism and the belief that older is better was common throughout the ancient Greco-Roman world.

In much the same tenor as one sees in Varro, Seneca states, “There is no life freer and more innocent, none which better cherishes the ancient ways, than that which, leaving city walls behind, loves the woods.”⁷² Varro and Seneca, then, connect life in the country with the more ancient, “better” life, and both would almost certainly have envisioned a rural utopia.⁷³

Even for those ancients living in the city, many decorated and designed their homes with gardens and the pastoral life in mind.⁷⁴ Through a study of the remains of ancient Roman villas, Annette Giesecke has argued this point suggesting that

Romans of the late Republic tremendously amplified a principle fundamental to the conception of the Roman house and articulation of space therein. This principle, which is the “primacy of the garden,” in itself evidences a strong utopian impulse underlying urban architecture in the domestic

⁷² Seneca, *Phaedr.* 483–485; translated in Lovejoy and Boas, *Primitivism*, 284.

⁷³ Other examples of the preference for a rural lifestyle include Cato, *Agr.* Preface–1.7; Varro, *Rust.* 2.1.1–2; Horace, *Ep.* 1.16.8–18; Seneca, *Ep.* 87.41; Pliny, *Ep.* 1.14.4–6. See Evans, *Utopia Antiqua*, 83–87.

⁷⁴ Nicholas Purcell has an excellent piece on the tension between city life and life in the country. He gives a carefully nuanced position on the degrees to which Romans wished for the latter (Nicholas Purcell, “Town in Country and Country in Town,” in *Ancient Roman Villa Gardens* [ed. E. B. MacDougall; Washington: Dumbarton Oaks, 1987], 186–203).

sphere. The ideal Roman house had a garden at its core; it was constructed around and was simultaneously penetrated everywhere by nature inscribed. Thus it would be in the reach of all, or most, to (re)capture a bit of paradise and to thrive in its embrace.⁷⁵

Through the study of urban architecture, the importance of and the preference for rural life becomes even more evident.⁷⁶

2.3.1.2. *Urban Utopias*

Though both primitivistic and afterlife utopianism overtly favored a rural setting, the urbanism of political utopianism must also be addressed. In Plato's *Laws* and *Republic* he attempts to create an ideal city-state. Lovejoy and Boas note that Plato held a "moderate form of cultural primitivism," and his desire to mold and perfect the city rather than abandon it is one way in which he did not blithely accept primitivistic ideals.⁷⁷

The setting of utopia, therefore, is one way in which Dawson is right to distinguish between political utopianism and, what he calls, folk utopianism (understood here as primitivistic and afterlife utopianism). Lewis Mumford has called the latter "utopias of escape" and the former "utopias of reconstruction." Of the two types he writes,

On one hand the pseudo-environment or idolum is a substitute for the external world; it is a sort of house of refuge to which we flee when our contacts with "hard facts" become too complicated to carry through or too rough to face. On the other hand, it is by means of the idolum that the facts

⁷⁵ Annette Lucia Giesecke, "Beyond the Garden of Epicurus: The Utopics of the Ideal Roman Villa," *Utopian Studies* 12 (2001): 27. For more on Greek gardens, see Maureen Carroll-Spillecke, *Kepos: Der antike griechische Garten* (Munich: Deutscher Kunstverlag, 1989); idem, "Griechische Garten," in *Der Garten von der Antike bis zum Mittelalter* (Kulturgeschichte der antiken Welt 57; ed. M. Carroll-Spillecke; Mainz: Philipp von Zabern, 1992), 153–75; Robin Osborne, "Classical Greek Gardens: Between Farm and Paradise," in *Garden History: Issues, Approaches, Methods* (ed. J. Dixon. Washington: Dumbarton Oaks, 1992), 373–91.

⁷⁶ A. Bartlett Giamatti notes the ancient connection between the garden and the life of ease. He writes that garden scenes as depicted by ancient, Latin poets have in common "a sense of satisfaction and completeness, both for the poet who created the scene and whatever character is involved in the scene. And it is this sense of individual, personal harmony with a garden, this ideal of some kind of fulfillment in a landscape, that is passed on to the poets of Rome" (*The Earthly Paradise and the Renaissance Epic* [Ontario: Penguin Books, 1966; repr., New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1989], 39). See also Jean Delumeau who connects gardens to ancient utopias (*History of Paradise: The Garden of Eden in Myth & Tradition* [tr. M. O'Connell; Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 2000], 10). For more on the pastoral setting of utopia, see Annette Lucia Giesecke, "Lucretius and Virgil's Pastoral Dream," *Utopian Studies* 10 (1999): 1–15.

⁷⁷ Lovejoy and Boas, *Primitivism*, 155.

of the everyday world are brought together and assorted and sifted, and a new sort of reality is projected back again upon the external world. One of these functions is escape or compensation; it seeks an immediate release from the difficulties or frustrations of our lot. The other attempts to provide a condition for our release in the future. The utopias that correspond to these two functions I shall call the utopias of escape and the utopias of reconstruction. The first leaves the external world the way it is; the second seeks to change it so that one may have intercourse with it on one's own terms. In one we build impossible castles in the air; in the other we consult a surveyor and an architect and a mason and proceed to build a house which meets our essential needs; as well as houses made of stone and mortar are capable of meeting them.⁷⁸

Mumford's terminology of "escape" and "reconstruction" are particularly helpful with regard to the setting of utopia. Political utopias, particularly low utopias, are intended to change the political structure of a given society and necessarily require the presence of the polis as its setting. On the other hand, primitivistic and afterlife utopias are typically a means of envisioning another world, a world that does not look like our own, a world that sometimes breaks the "rules" of our world order, and a world that is a better version of our own. In order to do this, these utopias "escape," typically to rural settings where nature and what is "natural" are readily present.

Nevertheless, despite the appropriateness of Mumford's terminology for the setting of utopia, these terms are not always appropriate for the function of these utopias. Often utopias of escape are capable of serving a similar function to that of utopias of reconstruction. Though escape may be taking place at the level of the narrative, these utopian descriptions can invite the reader into reconceiving one's notion of what is possible in this world and what is good. They do this not through legislation or the creation of a perfect society but through constructing an alternative reality that critiques the present reality.⁷⁹ Utopias of escape set up a *Gegenwelt*, or a "contrast world," as a means of critiquing the status quo and

⁷⁸ Lewis Mumford, *The Story of Utopias* (New York: The Viking Press, 1962), 15.

⁷⁹ Mumford's distinction, when put in dialogue with Dawson's "low" and "high" utopianism, should cause one to ask whether the high utopianism of Plato's *Republic* is appropriately labeled a utopia of reconstruction or a utopia of escape. As Dawson argues, the *Republic* was not meant to be put into action, and Plato himself states that the city he describes might be a heavenly city meant to be contemplated rather than enacted (*Resp.* 592B). In this way, the *Republic* is a utopia of escape. Nevertheless, it functions to draw readers into a utopian world in order to contemplate what might be. Other utopias of escape can function similarly.

offering a vision for the good life, however fanciful it might be at times.⁸⁰ As Evans argues, the Roman Empire was exceptionally gifted at using the Golden Age narratives for political change.⁸¹

2.3.2. *Wealth and Communism*⁸²

Ironically, gold was thought not to be present during the Golden Age. According to most descriptions of the Golden Age, humans had not yet developed the technology to mine the earth for its precious metals, and this was seen as good.⁸³ In this way, “the Golden Age” is an ironic title for an age that lacked its namesake. Ovid recognizes this fact and sarcastically quips that his own age has more of a reason to be called the Golden Age,

Poems are praised, but big presents are sought after:
provided that he is rich, even a barbarian is loved.
These are truly the Golden Ages: the greatest respect goes
to gold: love is procured with gold.⁸⁴

Ovid is not alone in his pessimistic attitude toward gold and wealth in general. Many ancients believed the introduction of gold, silver, and precious materials into society was, at least in part, what led to the degeneration of society.⁸⁵ This *topos*, then, will address the problem that wealth poses to creating a utopian society, and more particularly, how ancients resolved this problem. While some saw no problem at all, most recognized the problem wealth, or at least the inequality of wealth, posed to a

⁸⁰ Biblical scholars have noted that the garden of Eden, or paradise, often serves the same function in ancient literature. See Fritz Stolz, “Paradiese und Gegenwelten,” *Zeitschrift für Religionswissenschaft* 1 (1993): 5–24.

⁸¹ Much of Evans’ *Utopia Antiqua* attempts to prove this point (cf. particularly pp. 2–3).

⁸² Throughout this and the following chapters, the word *communism* is used to describe a common element of utopianism. Dawson too uses this terminology, though Schmidt prefers *communitarianism* (e.g. Schmidt, *Utopian Communities*, 92). Another possibility would be *communalism*. *Communitarianism*, however, does not adequately encapsulate the radical nature of most utopian ideals (esp. the abolition of private property and sharing of all goods), and *communism* and *communalism* are near enough equivalents when placed in an ancient context.

⁸³ For examples of precious metals and riches not existing in the Golden Age, see Ovid, *Am.* 3.8.35–36; *Metam.* 1.125–151; Ps.-Seneca, *Octavia* 405–437. Plato also makes use of the lack of precious metals in his utopia (see *Laws* 678C–679C).

⁸⁴ *Ars.* 2.275–278; translation from Evans, *Utopia Antiqua*, 149.

⁸⁵ For example, Ovid, *Metam.* 1.137–144; Plato, *Laws* 678D–679E; Justin, *Hist. Phil. epit.* 2.2; Ps.-Seneca, *Octavia* 417–419; Virgil, *Aen.* 8.325–327. For more, see below under the *topos* “War and Peace.”

utopian society. Many proposed some form of communism as an answer. Each will be addressed below.

2.3.2.1. *Wealth as Positive*

Though certainly a minority position with regard to utopianism, some ancients saw no problem with the accumulation of wealth. Strabo, for example, takes an interest in the wealth of Iberia and, through a series of quotations from Homer, attributes to this place the supposed location of the Islands of the Blessed indicating he believed that others expected these islands to be filled with riches (*Geog.* 3.2.13).⁸⁶ Furthermore, he states that the Iberians got the name “Macraeones” (long-livers) because of their great prosperity suggesting he sees a link between riches and length of life (3.2.14). In these passages he also seems to link riches to the quality of one’s life. Despite Strabo’s positive portrayal of wealth, the majority of Greco-Roman authors writing about utopia held a different view.⁸⁷

2.3.2.2. *Wealth as Evil*

Some ancients rejected wealth and the accumulation of wealth altogether.⁸⁸ If riches were the problem, the answer was the removal of riches. In the quote above from Pompeius Trogus, he praises the Scythians because “gold and silver they despise, as much as other men covet them.”⁸⁹

⁸⁶ Whether Strabo himself believed in the mythical nature of the islands is doubtful. He instead describes them with more naturalistic attributes. For a similar approach to the Islands of the Blessed, see Plutarch, *Sertorius* 8.2–3.

⁸⁷ In another counter example to negativity toward wealth in ancient utopia, this time a primitivistic utopia, Tacitus equivocates over the goodness of riches and precious metals. In his account of the Germans, he portrays them as a primitivistic society, though he certainly does not idealize them. He states, “The gods have denied them gold and silver, whether in mercy or in wrath I find it hard to say.... At any rate, they are not affected, like their neighbours, by the use and possession of such things. One may see among them silver vases, given as gifts to their commanders and chieftains, but treated as of no more value than earthenware” (*Germ.* 5 [Hutton and Peterson, LCL]). Overall, Tacitus’ portrait of the Germans is hardly flattering, but neither is it overtly negative. His attitude toward their use of wealth is best described as ambivalent.

⁸⁸ For examples other than the ones given below, see also Lucian, *Sat.* 28–30; Lucretius, *De Rerum Natura* 5.113–1135, 1241–1280.

⁸⁹ Justin, *Hist. Phil. epit.* 2.2. In Diodorus Siculus’ account of the founding of Thebes, he tells of a story of Tnephachthus who, while in a distant land, had an experience with asceticism and enjoyed the experience so much he denounced luxury altogether (1.45.1–3). Not only did he do this, but he also pronounced a curse the first king of Thebes who “introduced luxury and an extravagant manner of life,” inscribing the curse on the temple of Zeus in Thebes. Diodorus states that Tnephachthus’ descendants, fifty-two total, reigned for more than one thousand forty years and “that in their reigns nothing occurred that was worthy of record.” Though this last statement may have been meant as a slight against the

Horace also seems to reflect this attitude, though speaking perhaps with hyperbole:

Though your riches surpassed the untouched treasure of Arabia and all the wealth of India, though your building rubble filled the Apulian and Tyrrhenian seas, if grim Necessity drives her adamantine nail into your head, you will not free yourself from fear or from the snares of death. The Scythians on their steppes live better lives, carrying their nomadic homes in carts after their fashion; the stern Getae too, whose unmeasured acres freely bear fruit and grain—one year's cultivation is enough for them and on these same terms their successor relieves them when a labour is over. . . .

If we truly feel remorse for our crimes, let us send our marble and jewels and useless gold, the very stuff of vice, up to the Capitol, urged on by the cries of eager crowds, or throw them into the nearest sea. The early lessons of depraved desire must be erased from minds that have been too tender and must now be moulded by harsher studies. (*Carm.* 3.24.1–16, 45–52 [West])

Horace urges his listeners to rid themselves of their wealth, marble, jewels and useless gold (whether into the sea or into the community's coffers), and to be “moulded by harsher studies” meaning lives that reflect those of the Scythians and the Getae, peoples known for their primitivism and simplicity of life.⁹⁰

Similarly, in his *Laws*, Plato devises an economy to govern his utopian city that is entirely agricultural. He removes the temptations of riches altogether by banning the accumulation of money, gold, and silver. There would be no trading, lending, banking, or debt of any kind. And as Ferguson notes, though this sounds implausible to modern ears, the Spartans had an economy very similar to this. Only great trading centers like Athens and Corinth would find this impossible.⁹¹

king and his descendants, it is more likely that it was meant as a compliment meaning there was no war, famine, disease, coup, or anything that would upset the perfectly balanced society of Thebes. And Diodorus Siculus seems to attribute this success to Tnephachthus' denunciation of luxury. For more on Tnephachthus, see also the *topos* of “War and Peace.”

⁹⁰ It is possible that Virgil's description of Elysium fits into this kind of attitude toward wealth. There is no mention of gold or precious jewels, and though communism is not explicitly referenced, Aeneas finds that no one in Elysium owns a home, perhaps indicating that private property is either forbidden or, more likely, unnecessary. Instead, the people of Elysium are said to “dwell in shady groves, and live on cushioned riverbanks and in meadows fresh with streams” (*Aen.* 6.673–675 [Fairclough, LCL]).

⁹¹ Ferguson, *Utopias*, 78.

Zeno takes Plato one step further suggesting that there is to be no currency at all in his ideal city.⁹² As Baldry notes, “There will be exchange of goods . . . but where all are wise, and all united by friendship, there is no need for buying and selling and therefore no need for money.”⁹³ Zeno, therefore, does away with currency altogether.⁹⁴

The Cynic program also preferred to shun wealth. Diogenes prided himself on his lack of possessions and encouraged his followers to become like him.⁹⁵ For example, he encouraged Crates to “give up his fields to sheep pasture, and throw into the sea any money he had” (Diogenes Laertius, *Lives* 6.87 [Hicks, LCL]).⁹⁶ Similarly, it is said of the Cynics that “Wealth and fame and high birth they despise” (*Lives* 6.104). Finally, in the same way that Zeno and Plato are said to do away with currency in their ideal cities, so also Diogenes is said to replace traditional coinage with “knuckle-bones,” i.e. dice.⁹⁷

2.3.2.3. *Wealth as Potentially Evil*

Diogenes Laertius writes that, sometime around the fourth-century BCE, the philosopher Diogenes said, “The love of money is the mother-city of all evils” (*Lives* 6.50 [Hicks, LCL]).⁹⁸ This sentiment would have been shared by a wide audience in the Greco-Roman world. Wealth, for many, is seen and described as a corrupting power. Yet even among those who would agree that wealth is a destructive force, however, are different

⁹² Diogenes Laertius, *Lives* 7.33.

⁹³ Baldry, “Zeno’s Ideal State,” 11. See also Schmidt, *Utopian Communities*, 18–20.

⁹⁴ Porphyry tells of the legislation of Lycurgus who supposedly did away with currency with the following result: “No trading vessel sailed into the harbours, no professional speaker came into Laconia, no vagrant prophet, no pimp, no maker of gold or bronze ornaments, because there was no currency” (*Abst.* 4.3.5 [Clark]).

⁹⁵ Epictetus, *Disc.* 3.24.67; Xenophon, *Banquet* 4.34–44; Dio Chrys. *Tyr.* 6.30–34.

⁹⁶ See Lovejoy and Boas, who note that according to Cynics, “The rich were not to be envied or pillaged but pitied and despised. . . . They were less concerned that men should have economic goods in common than that they should have as few of them as possible” (*Primitivism*, 123).

⁹⁷ Athenaeus, *Deipn.* 4.59C. Dawson notes that dice was a rhetorical *topos* among ancient Greeks. In the same work by Athenaeus that replaces currency with dice, one finds that Cratinus, a fifth-century BCE comedian, “described the men of Cronus’ time playing dice with loaves of bread to illustrate the superabundance of food in the golden age (*Ath.* 6.267e)” (*Cities of the Gods*, 180).

⁹⁸ τὴν φιλαργυρίαν εἶπε μητρόπλιν πάντων τῶν κακῶν. Though one might think of the phrase, “The love of money is the root of all evil,” as biblical in origin, it appears on the lips of Diogenes well before the New Testament was written (see Matt 6:24; Luke 16:13; 1 Tim 6:10; Heb 13:5).

expectations of how one should handle wealth. And despite the tendency in some to demonize wealth and possessions altogether, there are others who, though they accept that wealth has the *potential* for evil, do not shun wealth outright. In fact, these writers often recognize that wealth can sometimes bring enjoyment and pleasure. Thus Solon, for example, says that he desires to have riches, and argues that “money, when a man makes it, is the gift of the gods, but disaster can grow out of money, and when retribution comes at the sending of Zeus, none can tell where it will light” (Solon, *fr.* 1 [Lattimore]).⁹⁹

Rather than seeing wealth itself as the problem, then, some see the uneven distribution of wealth as most troubling. The answer to this problem, therefore, is not the removal of wealth but its proper distribution. For these, gold, silver, and money are not evil *per se*; it is the hoarding of wealth by the rich that is problematic. In the ancient world (as with all times and places) there were those who had abundance and those who lived hand to mouth, many dying as a result of their poverty. Lucian, for example, laments the gap that exists between the rich and the poor and contrasts it to an idealized reality where all things are equal. Thus in his work *Saturnalia*, Lucian describes the festival of Saturnalia, a period of seven days at which time all things are supposed to be returned to a Golden Age-like state.¹⁰⁰ In a satirical back-and-forth between Lucian and Cronus (Saturn), Lucian states the following:

Indeed I hear the poets saying that things were not like that in old times when you were still lord. No, the earth produced its good things for the folk without sowing and without ploughing, an ample meal ready to each man's hand; the rivers flowed some with wine, some with milk, and others again with honey.¹⁰¹ And, above all, they say the men themselves were gold and poverty was nowhere near. As for us, we could not even be thought of as lead, but something meaner, if such there be; and for most of us food is won with toil; and poverty, want, and helplessness, and ‘alas!’, and ‘how can I get it?’, and ‘oh, what bad luck!’ and such exclamations are plentiful, at least among us poor.

⁹⁹ See Ferguson, *Utopias*, 43.

¹⁰⁰ For other accounts of Saturnalia, see Seneca, *Ep.* 18.1–2; Horace, *Satire* 2.7; Martial, *Epigrams* 14; Macrobius, *Saturnalia*; Catallus, 14.15. Cf. Lovejoy and Boas, *Primitivism*, 65–68.

¹⁰¹ Rivers of wine, milk, and honey, here descriptors of the Golden Age, also show up in Lucian's description of the afterlife on the Island of the Blessed in *A True Story* (2.13). It should be no surprise that primitivistic descriptions and afterlife descriptions are often identical.

We should be less distressed about it, you may be sure, if we did not see the rich living in such bliss, who, though they have such gold, such silver in their safes, though they have all that clothing and own slaves and carriage-horses and tenements and farms each and all in large numbers, not only have never shared them with us, but never deign even to notice ordinary people. This is what sticks in our throats most of all. . . . So either, Cronus, change the situation and give us instead of our present lot an equal share in life, or, at the very least, bid these rich men stop their solitary enjoyment of the good things and out of all their bushels of gold throw down a measure for us all. (*Sat.* 20–21 [Kilburn, LCL])

It is no coincidence that on this matter of inequality between poor and rich, Lucian is speaking to Cronus, the god who reigned during the Golden Age, a time when all people were thought to have all things necessary for the enjoyment of life. Lucian, then, is asking Cronus for a return to a golden-age economy where all people had an equal lot in life.

2.3.2.4. *Communism in Ancient Utopia*

In utopian writings a common solution to the problem of unequal access to wealth and riches is some kind of communistic economic system. If everyone shared all things in common, *panta koina*, wealth and riches would not be a problem because they would be either removed altogether or shared by all. Communism as an ideal for utopia, then, is a ubiquitous motif in the ancient world.¹⁰² For many, communism not only meant equal access to money but also property, possessions, and sometimes even wives and children.

The sharing of wives was a common motif among many ancient Greco-Roman thinkers.¹⁰³ One first finds it in Herodotus among the Massagetae, the Agathyrsi, and the Ausees.¹⁰⁴ After a child has been born, Herodotus,

¹⁰² The subtitle of Dawson's work, for example, is "Communist Utopias in Greek Thought." Similarly, Ferguson's work on utopias in the ancient world recognizes that communism is a foregone conclusion.

¹⁰³ Beyond the examples below, see also Pliny, *Nat.*, 5.8.45; Pomponius Mela, 1.45; Solinus 30.2; Clem. Alex., *Strom.*, 3.2.10; Sextus Empiricus, *Outlines of Pyrrhonism*, 3.205; Epictetus, *Discourses*, 2.4.8–10. Cf. Ferguson for a long list of utopian-like communities that are said to share wives in common (*Utopias*, 19–20). See also Baldry, "Zeno's Ideal State," 9–10.

¹⁰⁴ Herodotus, *Hist.*, 1.216, 4.104, 4.180 respectively. See Dawson for a discussion on Herodotus' mixed positions regarding sexual communism among the "barbarians" (*Cities of the Gods*, 18–21). Often Herodotus is critical toward this kind of behavior and reports it in order to "shock, titillate, and confirm his Greek readers in their conviction of cultural superiority" (*Cities of the Gods*, 19). Sometimes, however, he provides the seeds for later utopists casting sexual communism in a positive light.

and later Aristotle, report of societies who assign the child to a man the child most resembles.¹⁰⁵ Iambulus, whose Island of the Sun contains both a community of wives and a community of children, says that the result of this environment is that all adults will love all children equally.¹⁰⁶ Nicolas of Damascus similarly tells of a Scythian tribe who hold wives in common and each member considers anyone older to be his father, anyone younger to be his son, and anyone of the same age to be his sibling.¹⁰⁷

Political utopianism employed the motif of common wives and children frequently. Plato's *κοινωνία γυναικῶν*, or "community of wives", is well known from his *Republic* (739C). Zeno, in his *Republic*, also talks about a "community of wives" as does Diogenes.¹⁰⁸ Diogenes Laertius reports: "It is also their doctrine that amongst the wise there should be a community of wives with free choice of partners, as Zeno says in his *Republic* and Chrysippus in his treatise *On Government* [and not only they, but also Diogenes the Cynic and Plato]" (*Lives* 7.131 [Hicks, LCL]).¹⁰⁹

Similarly, primitivistic utopianism also contains a tradition of a community of wives. For example, Agatharchides tells of the Ichthyophagi

¹⁰⁵ Herodotus, *Hist.*, 4.180; Aristotle, *Pol.*, 1262 a.

¹⁰⁶ Diodorus Siculus 2.58.1.

¹⁰⁷ Jacoby, *FGH*, n. 90, 104.

¹⁰⁸ For Zeno, see Diogenes Laertius, *Lives* 7.33, 131; for Diogenes, see Diogenes Laertius, *Lives* 6.72.

¹⁰⁹ According to Dawson, this issue of a "community of wives" led the Stoics and Cynics to the uncomfortable position of the acceptability of incest (see *Cities of the Gods*, 181–85). Sextus Empiricus, for example, quotes from the stoic Chrysippus, noting that his *Republic* states, "I approve of carrying out those practices—which, quite rightly, are customary even nowadays amongst many peoples—according to which a mother has children by her son, the father by his daughter, the brother by his full sister" (*Pyr.* 3.246 [Bury, LCL]). Most scholars follow Zeller arguing that these kinds of statements are merely a matter of someone trying to slander his opponent (Eduard Zeller, *The Stoics, Epicureans, and Skeptics* [tr. Oswald J. Reichel; London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1870]). Dawson rightly argues that the problem of incest is rightly understood in the context of "the community of wives." The idea behind the community of wives was not a matter of physical pleasure but of erasing ties based on family and replacing those ties with ties based on virtue and one's relationship to the larger society. To this end, Diogenes Laertius notes the following about Zeno, "In the *Republic*, making an invidious contrast, he declares the good alone to be true citizens or friends or kindred or free men; and accordingly in the view of the Stoics parents and children are enemies, not being wise" (*Lives* 7.33 [Hicks, LCL]). In a society where parent-child relationships are disintegrated, what would presumably happen is a father would not know his daughters and mother would not know her sons. And though this situation was held up as the ideal, for some it raised a serious problem, i.e., the possibility of accidental incest. Dawson suggests that early writers like Zeno, and even Plato, did not press the issue and spoke little of it, but by the time of Chrysippus a century later, Chrysippus felt the need to defend Zeno and argued more forcefully that there is nothing wrong with occasional incest.

who wear no clothes and procreate with freedom and without the bonds of marriage.¹¹⁰ Theopompus says that for the Etruscans, it was law that wives be held in common (*Ath.* 13.517D).

Utopia has all goods in common, sometimes all women in common, but also all land in common. As Evans notes, "Land division in itself is a feature of the Iron Age in Roman texts... forming a final breakdown of the Golden Race's communal living."¹¹¹ The same can be said of Hellenistic texts. For example, though Plato suggests that land should be apportioned to the citizens of the city, he qualifies the act: "And let the apportionment be made with this intention,—that the man who receives the portion should still regard it as common property of the whole State" (*Laws* 740A [Bury, LCL]).

Certain primitivistic societies are said to share land.¹¹² For example, Tacitus states that Germans do not own their land, but rotate it according to rank (*Germ.* 26.2 [Hutton and Peterson, LCL]). Similarly, Ovid states that it was at the beginning of the Bronze Age, the present, that "the ground, which had hitherto been a common possession like the sunlight and the air, the careful surveyor now marked out with long-drawn boundary-line" (*Metam.* 1.134–136 [Miller, LCL]). This expectation was also found in the political utopianism of Plato but critiqued by Aristotle. Plato, for example, states that equality will never be achieved unless "equality of property" is established (*Laws* 684D). Perhaps in response, Aristotle critiques Plato because he states that the common use of property was already being practiced in cities like Sparta.¹¹³

Despite the popularity of communism among utopian thinkers, one exception to the rule is worth noting. Aristotle directly addresses both the issue of economic communism and the community of wives, rejecting both. Regarding the community of wives, he argues that the complications that arise when children are shared by all are too great. The words "father" and "son" become diluted and mean nothing. He explicitly critiques Plato

¹¹⁰ Diodorus Siculus, 3.15.1. Diodorus Siculus (3.24.1) says that the Hylophagi and the Spermatophagi also hold their wives in common. The Trogodytes are similar; the only difference is that the wife of the leader is not allowed to be promiscuous (3.32.1).

¹¹¹ Evans, *Utopia Antiqua*, 85. Here she cites Virgil, *Georg.* 1.126–127; Tibullus, 1.3.43–44; Ovid *Am.* 3.8.42–43; *Metam.* 1.121–122; Seneca, *Ep.* 90.36; Ps.-Seneca, *Octavia* 414; Juvenal, *Sat.* 6.17–18.

¹¹² For a helpful article the sharing of property, see Alexander Fuks, "Τοῖς ἀποροϋμένοις κοινωνεῖν: The Sharing of Property by the Rich with the Poor in Theory and Practice," in *Social Conflict in Ancient Greece* (Jerusalem: The Magnes Press, 1984), 172–89.

¹¹³ Pol., 1263b.29–37; see also Schmidt, *Utopian Communities*, 17.

saying, “In the republic described by Plato there will be the least possible necessity for people to care for one another as father for sons or as son for father or as brother for brother” (*Pol.* 1262b [Fowler and Lamb, LCL]). He points to the importance of possessing something in order to have an emotional attachment to it. He states, “For there are two motives that most cause men to care for things and be fond of them, the sense of ownership and the sense of preciousness; and neither motive can be present with the citizens of a [communistic] state” (*Pol.* 1262b).¹¹⁴

Similarly, regarding economic communism Aristotle argues that communism does not take into account how difficult it is to “live together and share all our human affairs” (*Pol.* 1263a [Freese, LCL]). He states that people who jointly own anything quarrel more than those who own things individually. The result is that the communistic ideal, while it has “an attractive and humanitarian air” in theory, does not work in practice. Ferguson summarizes Aristotle’s position this way: “Of three alternatives, public ownership and public use, public ownership and private use, and private ownership and public use, he prefers the last.”¹¹⁵ Aristotle’s utopia, then, is not merely a recitation of ideas of those who come before him.

2.3.2.5. *Wealth and Luxurious Common Property*

Before moving on from the *topos* of wealth and communism, it should be mentioned that there are a number of examples of Greco-Roman texts that describe cities with grandeur, decorated with a decadence that seems counterintuitive to the notions of wealth as described above.¹¹⁶ For example, Lucian describes the city on his Island of the Blessed as follows: “The city itself is all gold and the wall around it of emerald. . . . The foundations of the city and the ground within its walls are ivory. There are temples of all the gods, built of beryl, and in them great monolithic altars of amethyst, on which they make their great burnt-offerings” (*Ver. hist.* 2.11 [Harmon, LCL]). Clearly Lucian’s ideal city is filled with all manner of riches.

¹¹⁴ Cf. Ferguson, *Utopias*, 83.

¹¹⁵ Ferguson, *Utopias*, 83–84.

¹¹⁶ For example, the *Sibylline Oracles* state that Marcus Aurelius decorated the “walls of Rome with gold and silver and ivory” (*Sib. Or.* 12.192). Josephus tells us that parts of the Herodian temple were plated with gold (*J.W.* 5.201, 205, 207–208). And Diodorus Siculus gives a description of the city of Thebes in which he says it was the most ornate city ever constructed; gold, silver, and ivory were prevalent throughout the city (1.45–46). Rather than attributing this to expectations of utopia, it is more likely that this is part of the genre of *laus urbis*, or praise of a city. Two lengthy descriptions of this genre come from Quintilian, *Inst.*, 3.7.26–28, and Menander Rhetor, *Rhet.*, 1.346.27–351.19.

If wealth is understood to contain corrupting powers, the decadence of Lucian's city on the Island of the Blessed is, at face value, problematic. Why would Lucian, who questions the propriety of great wealth, use those same symbols to show the grandness of utopia?¹¹⁷ Though this may seem problematic at first blush, the evidence suggests that Lucian has used gold and wealth in a way that is in keeping with his communistic tendencies. In his description of the magnificent city, wealth is not owned and displayed by individuals. It is part of the common property. The streets, the walls, the temples, and the altars are all common property. In this way, then, a golden city makes sense of the communistic tendencies of utopia insofar as the gold is held by all people and used for common purposes. It is a beauty to which all citizens have access.

Plato's afterlife description is remarkably similar regarding the presence of beautiful stones and wealth. He states that the earth we now enjoy is only a shadow of the heavens that await:

Our highly prized stones, sards and jaspers, and emeralds, and other gems, are fragments of those there, but there everything is like these or still more beautiful. . . . And the earth there is adorned with all these jewels and also with gold and silver and everything of the sort. For there they are in plain sight, abundant and large and in many places, so that the earth is a sight to make those blessed who look upon it. (*Phaed.* 110D–111A [Fowler, LCL])

As with Lucian, Plato describes the afterlife as a place adorned with precious materials. And in keeping with many ancient attitudes toward wealth, Plato describes an afterlife where precious materials abound to such a degree that they are in plain sight for all to see and all to share.

Finally, Horace echoes this sentiment stating that during the time of Romulus, a chronologically primitivistic age, personal wealth was limited and the wealth of the public was elevated.¹¹⁸

This is not what was prescribed by the auspices taken by Romulus and bearded Cato and by the rule of the ancients. Their private wealth was small. Their public wealth was great. No portico laid out by ten-foot rod caught the dense northern shade for private citizens. The laws commanded them not to despise the turf beneath their feet, but to beautify at common cost their towns and the temples of their gods with freshly quarried stone. (*Carm.* 2.15.10–20 [West]; cf. 3.45–52)

¹¹⁷ For examples of Lucian's negative attitude toward wealth, see *Cat.* 16–17, 28–29; *Sat.* 1–2; 7; 8; 11; 13; 19; 20.

¹¹⁸ For Romulus' years as something of a Golden Age, see Evans, *Utopia Antiqua*, 83–87.

Horace explicitly states that from the cities' coffers the towns are to be beautified and the temples are to be adorned with marble. The latter is specifically mentioned in Lucian's city, and the former is done as well. What seems to be a problem in Lucian's city, i.e. displays of wealth, is actually no problem at all. Lucian's city, therefore, is a utopian city not in spite of but because of its adornment of public property.

In conclusion, the ancient Greco-Roman world often expected some sort of communism and sharing of possessions, property, and sometimes wives and children in utopia. Wealth was perceived by some to be a corrupting force that should be removed altogether, but others perceived the problem as one of access to wealth—the rich had it and the poor did not. The solution for these thinkers, then, was that a utopian society would be one in which all citizens would have access to wealth.

2.3.3. *Temples*

The presence of temples and sacrifices to the gods persists in the majority of utopian writings. Examples from primitivism abound.¹¹⁹ In particular Diodorus Siculus notes that the Hyperboreans, primitivists *par excellence*, are said to be the priests of Apollo (2.47.2). Pausanias also remarks that from the Hyperboreans comes the first prophet of Phoebus and thus have a link to the Oracles at Delphi.¹²⁰ Delos, much like Delphi in that they are both centers for the Apollo cult, has a tie to the Hyperboreans as told by Herodotus (4.32–36).¹²¹

In the political utopian literature of Plato are also references to temples in utopia. In his ideal city Plato includes temples to the gods at a central location in the marketplace and in the high points of the city.¹²² Temples are even present in Plato's afterlife utopia. He describes the heavens, where the righteous are taken after death, as a place where the citizens have "sacred groves and temples of the gods, in which the gods really dwell, and they have intercourse with the gods by speech and prophecies

¹¹⁹ Examples from primitivistic writings include: Aelian, *Nat. an.* 11.1; Caesar, *Bell. gall.* 6.21; Diodorus Siculus, 2.47.2; 5.42.6; 5.44.1; 6.1.6; Horace, *Carm.* 2.15; Strabo, *Geog.* 11.4.7; Virgil, *Georg.* 2.140–148, 190–194.

¹²⁰ *Graec. Descr.* 10.5.7–9. This tradition is also mentioned by Alcaeus as recorded in Himerius, *Orat.* 14.10. For an excellent introduction to the Hyperborean peoples, see Timothy P. Bridgman, *Hyperboreans: Myth and History in Celtic-Hellenic Contacts* (Studies in Classics; New York: Routledge, 2005). See also Romm, *Edges of the Earth*, 63–64; Clay and Purvis, *Four Island Utopias*, 162–68.

¹²¹ See Romm, *Edges of the Earth*, 61–62; Clay and Purvis, *Four Island Utopias*, 164–65.

¹²² Plato, *Laws* 778C–D (see also *Laws* 761C).

of visions" (*Phaed.* 111B [Fowler, LCL]). Lucian also includes temples to the gods in his afterlife. Though he is writing satire, his *Island of the Blessed* includes temples to "all the gods" (*Ver. hist.* 2.11).

A significant exception to the rule is Zeno's political utopia as described by Diogenes Laertius. Diogenes states that in his *Republic*, Zeno "takes 200 lines to forbid the building of temples, law courts and gymnasia in cities."¹²³ Citing Epiphanius, Dawson suggests that the reason for prohibiting temples in his utopian city is because Zeno believed the cults of the gods should be replaced with the worship of universal reason. Epiphanius writes, "We ought not to build temples to the gods, but to possess divinity in the mind alone; or rather to consider the mind as god, for it is immortal" (*Pan.* 3.2.9).¹²⁴ Similarly, Plutarch writes, "It is a doctrine of Zeno's not to build temples of the gods, because a temple not worth much is also not sacred and no work of builders or mechanics is worth much." (*Stoic rep.* 1034b [Perrin]). Baldry seems to have misunderstood Plutarch when he states that Plutarch calls temples unholy because of an "accepted prejudice" against builders and artisans.¹²⁵ Rather, as Dawson notes, Plutarch is not attacking builders and artisans, he is instead repeating the ideals of the Stoics and is, therefore, attacking superstition and the worship of gods that are not really gods. As Dawson writes, "To say that idols are made of base materials unworthy of divinity was a commonplace in philosophical critiques of the cults in Hellenistic and Roman times."¹²⁶ Zeno wished to replace the temples and the worship of gods, then, with what he believed to be truly immortal: reason. The result, however, is that this exception is just that, an idiosyncratic understanding of the gods, the temple, and their presence in utopia.¹²⁷

¹²³ Diogenes Laertius, 7.33; cited in Dawson, *Cities of the Gods*, 167. The translation is from Dawson because, as he notes, there are two options for translating this passage: "at line 200" or "in 200 lines" (214–15 n. 17; *καὶ κατὰ τοὺς διακοσίους <στίχους>*). Dawson has (rightly) chosen the latter because while an exact textual reference like "at line 200" is rare in the ancient world, noting the length of space devoted to a passage is not.

¹²⁴ Translated in Dawson, *Cities of the Gods*, 179.

¹²⁵ Baldry, "Zeno's Ideal State," 10–11. Schmidt (*Utopian Communities*, 18) appears to misunderstand Plutarch in a way similar to Baldry.

¹²⁶ *Cities of the Gods*, 216 n. 35. He cites Ramsay MacMullen, *Paganism in the Roman Empire* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1981), 76. He also notes that Christians pick up on this critique and use it widely (*Cities of the Gods*, 210). Cf. Clement of Alexandria, Origen, Epiphanius, and Theodoret in *SVF* 1.264–265.

¹²⁷ Contra Doron Mendels who states that the people of Iambulus' Island of the Sun have no temple ("Hellenistic Utopia and the Essenes," *HTR* 72 [1979]: 216). Why Mendels argues this is unclear since Iambulus makes no mention one way or the other about the presence (or absence) of a temple on the island (our knowledge of this account is limited

In conclusion, Zeno provides the only example of a utopia where temples are explicitly said to be absent. Outside of Zeno, temples are either assumed as part of the topography of utopia, or they are simply not mentioned at all.

2.3.4. *Rivers/Water*

Rivers play an important role in ancient descriptions of utopia. Below are noted the variety of ways rivers function in utopia as well as the cosmological significance of the earth's largest river, Oceanus.

2.3.4.1. *Rivers in Utopia*

Rivers can function in a number of ways, whether for bathing, as a source of water for drinking, as boundary markers for the geography of the after-life, and as a source of regeneration and healing.¹²⁸ There are tales of rivers that flow with milk, honey, and wine, and there are even tales of rivers of broth “whirling hot slices of meat,” rivers of porridge, and rivers of cheese-cake.¹²⁹ In this way, utopia's rivers often provide both the necessities and luxuries of life without the work required to obtain them.

Rivers are also used as a means of beautifying a city and its buildings. Homer's idyllic description of the palace of the Phaeacians serves as a good example:¹³⁰

There again, by the last row of the vines, grow trim garden beds of every sort, blooming the year through, and in the orchard are two springs, one of which sends its water throughout all the garden, while the other, opposite to it, flows beneath the threshold of the court toward the high house; from

to Diodorus Siculus, 2.55.1–60.3). It is possible Mendels is assuming a connection between Iambulus and the Stoics, a connection other scholars have made, but Mendels does not explicitly make that connection—for this connection, see Dawson, *Cities of the Gods*, 172.

¹²⁸ In Iambulus' description of a utopian island near Arabia, he tells of an abundance of springs of water, “the warm springs serving well for bathing and the relief of fatigue, the cold excelling in sweetness and possessing the power to contribute to good health” (Diodorus Siculus, 2.57.3 [Oldfather, LCL]; cf. 2.59.9; 5.19.3; 5.44.3). Horace also tells of springs of healing (*Ep.* 1.16.12–16). See also Lucian, *Ver. hist.*, 2.11.13; Athenaeus, *Deipn.* 6.268a; Strabo, *Geog.* 11.4.2–3; Virgil, *Georg.* 2.155–157; Homer, *Od.* 5.70–71.

¹²⁹ Athenaeus, *Deipn.* 6.268–269; Lucian, *Sat.* 7; 20; Ovid, *Metam.* 1.111–112.

¹³⁰ For a similar description of a palace making use of the beauty of rivers, see the description of the city of Babylon in Diodorus Siculus (2.8.1–9.1). Similarly, Plato describes an ideal city in which rivers and springs are used to beautify the city and its buildings. So, for example, he suggests that one might even direct streams “right into the temples of the gods” (*Laws* 761C).

this the townsfolk draw their water. Such were the glorious gifts of the gods at the dwelling of Alcinous. (*Od.* 7.127–132 [Murray, LCL])

Another important role of rivers in Greco-Roman tradition is their usefulness in identifying the entrance to the underworld. Ancient Greco-Romans believed it was possible to enter into the realm of the underworld if one knew what rivers to sail. Even more, once in the underworld, rivers help give shape to the map of the underworld. It is impossible to imagine a Hades that does not incorporate the tradition of the river Styx or Lethe, much less Acheron, Periphlegethon, and Cocytus.¹³¹

2.3.4.2. *Oceanus*

Perhaps the most important river in Greco-Roman tradition is the river Oceanus, a river that encircles the world.¹³² Archaic Greek traditions envision the earth as an island, usually circular, surrounded by Oceanus, which marks the edges of the world. This view is represented in Homer's shield of Achilles and Hesiod's shield of Heracles, both round,¹³³ and is criticized by Herodotus who states: "And I laugh to see how many have ere now drawn maps of the world, not one of them showing the matter reasonably; for they draw the world as round as if fashioned by compasses, encircled by the river Ocean, and Asia and Europe of a like bigness" (*Hist.* 4.36 [Godley, LCL]). Despite Herodotus' critique, however, Romm rightly notes that in the centuries after Herodotus, "many changes were rung on the world-map, but these were the concern of specialists; the general public remained tenaciously committed to the original circular construct."¹³⁴ Even by the time of Ptolemy in the second century CE, Ptolemy is still fighting the same battle that Herodotus fights. Ptolemy must state: "The known portion of the earth should be set out so that it does not have Ocean flowing everywhere around it, but only where the boundaries of Libya and Europe are marked out, in the direction of the winds Iapyx and Thrascia [i.e., West-northwest and North-northwest], in accordance with the ancient historians."¹³⁵ As Romm notes, the reference to "ancient historians" is likely a nod to Herodotus seven centuries prior.¹³⁶

¹³¹ See Plato, *Phaed.* 112E–113C.

¹³² For Oceanus' role in cosmology, see Albin Lesky, "Okeanos," in *Thalatta: Der Weg der Griechen zum Meer* (Vienna: Rohrer, 1947), 58–87.

¹³³ *Il.* 18.607–608; *Shield* 314–315; see Romm, *Edges of the Earth*, 13–14.

¹³⁴ Romm, *Edges of the Earth*, 41.

¹³⁵ Ptolemy, *Geography* 7.5.2; quoted in Romm, *Edges of the Earth*, 43.

¹³⁶ Romm, *Edges of the Earth*, 43–44.

The entrance to utopia or Hades is often found beyond Oceanus. For example, in the *Odyssey*, the goddess Circe sends Odysseus on a mission to hear the prophecy of Teiresias who has already died and is now in Hades. Confused, Odysseus responds by saying that no one has ever sailed there by ship. Circe tells Odysseus that in order to get there, one must cross the river Oceanus, a voyage that requires considerable navigational skill and no small amount of courage (10.501–512). It is only beyond this large river that Odysseus is able to gain access to Hades and the realm of the dead.

2.3.5. *Wine*

Though wine is absent from political utopianism, it is a popular characteristic of both primitivistic utopianism and afterlife utopianism. Sometimes there are rivers of wine.¹³⁷ Sometimes it rains wine.¹³⁸ Sometimes wine is poured by trees.¹³⁹ And sometimes it is poured by young women in silk shawls.¹⁴⁰ Usually, however, the wine is made the old-fashioned way; but the important point is not how it is made but that there is plenty of it.¹⁴¹

The Golden Age is certainly marked by this abundance of wine. Indeed Cronus, the god of Golden Age, is described as a wine-bibber, and the holiday of Saturnalia is therefore celebrated with an excessive amount of drinking.¹⁴² In Lucian's typical satiric fashion, he notes that at the feast of Saturnalia, during which time the world was supposed to be returned to the Golden Age for a few days, one of the few things that Cronus has power over is drinking plenty of wine (*Sat.* 24). The presence of much wine at the Saturnalia is an emblematic example of the widespread expectation that the good life involves much drinking, both for primitivistic and afterlife utopias.

2.3.6. *Food*

Food, for perhaps obvious reasons, is an important topic when discussing the nature of utopia. Important is not only *what* is eaten in utopia, but also

¹³⁷ Lucian, *Sat.* 7, 20; *Ver. hist.* 2.13; Athenaeus, *Deipn.* 6.268b.

¹³⁸ Athenaeus, *Deipn.* 6.269d.

¹³⁹ Lucian, *Ver. hist.* 2.14.

¹⁴⁰ Athenaeus, *Deipn.* 6.269b.

¹⁴¹ See Diodorus Siculus, 2.59.3; 5.43.3; Plato, *Resp.* 363D; Strabo, *Geog.* 11.4.3; Virgil, *Ecl.* 4.29; *Georg.* 2.190–94; Homer, *Od.* 5.68–69; 7.122–25; 9.105–111; Isidore, *Etymologies* 14.6.8; Tibullus, *Elegies* 1.10.47–48; 2.3.67–70.

¹⁴² For other ancient references to Saturnalia, see Seneca, *Ep.* 18.1–2; Horace, *Satire* 2.7; Martial, *Epigrams* 14; Macrobius, *Saturnalia*; Catallus, 14.15.

how that food is gathered and produced. Worth noting too is that there is no description of utopia in which food is explicitly said to be unnecessary. Even though the Greco-Roman afterlife was thought by most to be a non-corporeal existence, no ancient writer suggests that utopia is without food. Instead, food is assumed as a necessary part of the good life.

2.3.6.1. *Utopian Abundance*

Combined with Greco-Roman attitudes toward work in utopia (see below under the *topos* "Work"), ancients are faced with a conundrum: In a society that is supposed to be marked by little or no work, how does one grow crops, milk cows, catch fish and prepare dinner in utopia? In primitivistic and afterlife utopianism, this conundrum is solved with another ubiquitous attribute of utopia: natural fecundity. Time and again, utopia is portrayed as a place where the land itself grows crops without work or toil. As early as Hesiod's description of the Golden Age was an expectation that the land would produce food without the work that is required in "real life."¹⁴³

Even someone like Isidore of Seville, an ancient naturalist, appeals to natural fecundity as a part of utopia. In the following example he is trying to make sense of the Islands of the Blessed, islands he believes can be found and inhabited if one so wishes, though he strips them of their supernatural and eschatological expectations. His description is interesting for the *topos* of food, however, not because of what he leaves out, but because of what he includes.

The Fortunate Isles signify by their name that they produce all kinds of good things, as if they were happy and blessed with an abundance of fruit. Indeed, well-suited by their nature, they produce fruit from very precious trees; the ridges of their hills are spontaneously covered with grapevines; instead of weeds, harvest crops and garden herbs are common there. Hence the mistake of pagans and the poems by worldly poets, who believed that these isles were Paradise because of the fertility of their soil. They are situated in the Ocean, against the left side of Mauretania, closest to where the sun sets, and they are separated from each other by the intervening sea. (*Etymologies* 14.6.8 [Barney, et al.])

¹⁴³ The examples are endless and the following list is by no means exhaustive: Aeschylus, *frag.* 196; Babrius, *Aesopic Fables*, prologue 12–13; Diodorus Siculus, 2.47.1–2; 2.56.7; 2.59.1; 5.19.1–5; Hesiod, *Op.* 109–126; Homer, *Od.* 7.120–121; 9.105–115; Horace, *Epod.* 16.41–48; Lucian, *Sat.* 7, 20; *Ver. hist.* 2.13; Ovid, *Am.* 3.8.35–40; *Metam.* 1.89–112; Plato, *Laws* 713C; *Resp.* 363B; Ps.-Seneca, *Octavia* 404–406; Strabo, *Geog.* 11.4.3; Tibullus, *Elegies* 1.3.57–64; Varro, *Rust.* 2.1.4; Virgil, *Ecl.* 4.18–25.

Of all the expectations surrounding the Islands of the Blessed, this author seizes on the *topos* of natural fecundity and bases an entire theory about the location of these islands on the fertility of a set of islands he knows and perhaps has seen. This *topos* is so prevalent in the expectation of utopia that it can stand alone as *the* evidence for why someone might confuse ordinary islands with the mythical Islands of the Blessed.¹⁴⁴

The expectation of natural fecundity, while extremely popular in primitivistic and afterlife utopias, is not present at all in political utopianism. Because political utopianism works within the rules that govern the world as we know it and because natural fecundity is at odds with those rules, Plato and other utopists leave this motif aside. Once again, Mumford's distinction between "utopias of reconstruction" and "utopias of escape" is not altogether inappropriate.¹⁴⁵

2.3.6.2. *Agricultural Technology*

A corollary to natural fecundity is the notion that primitive peoples did not have, or need, farming technology. The Golden Age, for example, was marked by a lack of technology. Ovid in the *Amores* writes of the Golden Age,

When ancient Saturn had his kingdom in the sky, the deep earth held lucre all in its dark embrace. Copper and silver and gold and heavy iron he had hid away in the lower realms, and there was no massy metal. Yet better were his gifts—increase without the curved plough, and fruits and honeys brought to light from the hollow oak. And no one broke the earth with the strong plough, no measurer marked the limit of the soil, they did not sweep the seas, stirring the waters with dipping oar; the shore in those days was the utmost path for man. (*Am.* 3.8.35–44 [Showerman, LCL])

¹⁴⁴ Plutarch makes an identical move in describing islands in the Atlantic that he believes are confused for the Islands of the Blessed. He describes them as follows: "They enjoy moderate rains at long intervals, and winds which for the most part are soft and precipitate dews, so that the islands not only have a rich soil which is excellent for plowing and planting, but also produce a natural fruit that is plentiful and wholesome enough to feed, without toil or trouble, a leisured folk. . . . Therefore a firm belief has made its way, even to the Barbarians, that here is the Elysian Field and the abode of the blessed, of which Homer sang" (*Sertorius* 8.2–3 [Perrin, LCL]).

Similarly, Pomponius Mela: "The Fortunate Isles abound in spontaneously generated plants; and with various ones always producing new fruit in rapid succession, the islands nourish people who want for nothing, and whose islands are more blissfully productive than others are" (3.102 [Romer]).

¹⁴⁵ Mumford, *The Story of Utopia*, 15.

There are a number of themes running through this passage: a negative attitude toward riches and metals as mentioned above, natural fecundity, no need for farming, and no sea-fairing. The last two are best explained as foundational beliefs of a society that thought an increase in technology (whether agricultural, nautical, or otherwise) led to the demise of society. Of the technological advances primitivists rail against, agricultural technology is mentioned far more than any other.¹⁴⁶ Virgil, for example, states that during the reign of Saturn (i.e. the Golden Age) farmers did not plough the land (*Georg.* 1.126–127), and Ovid seems to agree stating that it was during Jupiter's reign (i.e. the present age) that the eternal spring was done away with, the four seasons were created causing hardship for humanity, and farming was first required (*Metam.* 1.113–124).¹⁴⁷

And yet there are challengers to the idea that agricultural technology should be associated with the decline of society. Homer, for example, states that the Cyclopes do not have agricultural technology, and he uses it to cast the Cyclopes in a negative light (*Od.* 9.107–112). Also, both Strabo and Pliny display contempt for less advanced societies by noting their lack of agriculture.¹⁴⁸ It is important to note, however, that both Strabo and Pliny have anti-primitivistic tendencies at times.¹⁴⁹

In conclusion, natural fecundity is an ever-present *topos* among primitivistic and afterlife utopias, but it is not found at all among political utopianism. Furthermore, natural fecundity can be linked to the *topos* of “work” in that it provides all of the necessary food for life and leisure without any of the work typically required. Finally, natural fecundity is often linked to anti-technology, particularly agricultural technology, because in both the Golden Age and the eschaton technology is unnecessary for the gathering and preparing of food.

2.3.7. Pleasant Fragrances

Many Greco-Roman utopias contain descriptions of pleasant fragrances as a way of portraying the pleasantness of the locale. Though this *topos* is not as common as some of the others, and, like the *topos* of wine, aromatic

¹⁴⁶ For more on the problems of technology, particularly nautical technology, see below under the *topos* “War and Peace.”

¹⁴⁷ See also Aeschylus, *Prom.* 442–468; Euripides, *Suppl.* 201–203. See Evans, *Utopia Antiqua*, 89–92.

¹⁴⁸ Strabo (*Geog.* 4.6.5) discusses the Britons, and Pliny (*Nat.* 6.53) the Scythians. See Evans, *Utopia Antiqua*, 87.

¹⁴⁹ See Lovejoy and Boas, *Primitivism*, 377.

bliss is not mentioned within the context of political utopianism, there are enough examples to warrant its inclusion on this list.¹⁵⁰ Homer, for example, describes the cave of Calypso as a place “even an immortal, who chanced to come, might gaze and marvel, and delight his soul” (*Od.* 5.73–74 [Murray, LCL]). Part of the description of the cave that makes it such an inviting place is that “a great fire was burning on the hearth, and far over the isle spread the fragrance of split cedar and citronwood, as they burned” (*Od.* 5.59–61).

In Pindar’s afterlife utopia, he describes Hades as “laden with . . . shady frankincense trees” and states that “a fragrance spreads throughout the lovely land” (*fr.* 129 [Race, LCL]). Propertius speaks of “Elysium’s perfumed fields” (*Elegies* 4.7.66). And Lucian, as his boat approaches the shore of the Island of the Blessed, remarks: “a wonderful breeze blew about us, sweet and fragrant, like the one that, on the word of the historian Herodotus, breathes perfume from Araby the blest. The sweetness that met us was as if it came from roses and narcissi and hyacinths and lilies and violets, from myrrh and laurel and vines in bloom” (*Ver. hist.* 2.5 [Harmon, LCL]). One can be sure that Lucian uses this *topos* intentionally because immediately following this description, Lucian writes that as a result of the sweet fragrance, he and his crew “cherish[ed] high hopes” indicating that one is expected to smell pleasant odors in utopia. Furthermore, upon leaving the island, Lucian uses the *topos* of fragrance as a transition from that island to the island of punishment. He writes, “Forging ahead, we had passed out of the fragrant atmosphere when [sic] of a sudden a terrible odour greeted us as of asphalt, sulphur, and pitch burning together, and a vile, insufferable stench as of roasting human flesh” (2.29). What follows is a description of his tour of the island of punishment. The description of that island is as frightening as the description of the Island of the Blest is enjoyable, both presaged by the odors they produce.

2.3.8. *Music*

In Greco-Roman literature, the abode of the gods is often filled with music. Music is also associated with the worship of the gods and nowhere more prevalent than with primitivistic cultures. The Hyperboreans have

¹⁵⁰ Besides the two examples cited below, see also Atheneus, *Deipn.* 6.268a; Ovid, *Metam.* 15.80; Tibullus, *Elegies* 1.3.61–62; Virgil, *Aen.* 6.658; *Ecl.* 4.23; Diodorus Siculus, 3.69.4. Propertius also uses this *topos* when he refers to “Elysium’s perfumed fields” (*Elegies* 4.7.66).

a particularly important role in this regard. Some traditions suggest that it is the Hyperboreans who first brought music to the world for the sole purpose of worshiping the gods. Pausanias, for example, tells of Olen, a child of the Hyperboreans who “was the first to prophesy and the first to chant the hexameter oracles” (*Graec. Descr.* 10.5.8 [Jones, LCL]). Pindar describes the Hyperboreans as a community in which “the dances of maidens and the sounds of the lyre and the notes of the flute are ever circling” (*Pyth.* 10.38–39 [Race, LCL]).¹⁵¹

Other primitivistic utopian descriptions include Euhemerus’ Panchea, which is said to have birds that constantly sing sweet melodies (Diodorus 5.43.2). Polybius has much to say about music in regards to the Arcadians, a group generally described as “just” and “pious”:

For the practice of music, I mean real music, is beneficial to all men, but to Arcadians it is a necessity.... [They] incorporat[e] music into their whole public life to such an extent that not only boys, but young men up to the age of thirty were compelled to study it constantly, although in other matters their lives were most austere. (*Hist.* 4.20–21 [Paton, LCL])

He goes on to suggest that the reason the Cynaetheans, a group from Arcadian stock, are inhumane is because they failed to take up this tradition, and the harshness of the countryside in which they live shaped them into a violent people. Polybius states that his wish for the Cynaetheans is that “if Heaven ever grant them better fortune, they may humanize themselves by turning their attention to education and especially to music” (4.21.11).¹⁵²

Beyond its use in primitivistic cultures, music can also be found in descriptions of the utopian afterlife. In Virgil’s description of Elysium, music plays an important role in much of the activities of the afterlife. Of the activities of those in the afterlife Virgil says,

Some tread the rhythm of a dance and chant songs. There, too, the long-robed Thracian priest [Orpheus, a priest of Apollo] matches their measures with the seven clear notes, striking the lyre now with his fingers, now with his ivory quill.... Others he sees, to right and left, feasting on the sward,

¹⁵¹ For more on music and the Hyperboreans, see also Aelian, *Nat. an.* 11.1; Diodorus Siculus, 2.47.3. Cf. Bridgman, *Hyperboreans*, 11; Clay and Purvis, *Four Island Utopias*, 165–67.

¹⁵² For more examples of primitivism and music, see Homer, *Od.* 5.60; 8.248; Lucian, *Sat.* 4; 25; Lucretius, *De Rerum Natura* 1379–1411. Diodorus Siculus, describing a primitivistic, paradisiac island locale, remarks on the beautiful music of the birds and nature; he writes that “the sweet tones which nature teaches are always superior to the song which is devised by art” (Diodorus Siculus, 3.69.2).

and chanting in chorus a joyous paean within a fragrant laurel grove. (*Aen.* 6.645–647, 656–658 [Fairclough, LCL])

Music, therefore, serves multiple roles in the afterlife, providing a pleasant environment, activities for those present, and even a means of worshipping the gods.

Similarly, Tibullus, describing the Elysian fields, writes the following:

My spirit, though, as I have always welcomed tender love,
 Venus herself will lead to the Elysian fields.
 There songs and dances flourish, and flitting everywhere
 Sweetly sing the birds their slender-throated tune.
 Untilled the lands bears cassia and over whole acres
 heavy-scented roses bloom from the rich loam.
 Young men and tender girls make sport, lined up together,
 Continually engaging in the battles of Love.
 There are all those whom Death raped while they were lovers
 And they wear the myrtle in token on their hair. (*Elegies* 1.3.57–66 [Lee])

Tibullus' description of Elysium has a number of utopian *topoi*, and the *topos* of music appears twice, first with the mention of "songs and dances" and second with the tunes of the birds. In much the same way, Propertius describes Elysium as a place "where music sounds from Lydian lyres and Cybele's cymbals in languid air" (*Elegies* 4.7.66–67). The expectation of music in utopia, then, is primarily found in primitivistic and afterlife utopias.¹⁵³

2.3.9. *Light*

The light source, the presence or absence of light, and the length of days and nights is not a prevailing *topos* in Greco-Roman utopianism, though we do have some examples of its use.¹⁵⁴ The early Greek afterlife of Homer and Hesiod suggest that Hades is a dark and even cold place where the sun does not shine. It is marked by the absence of light. Hesiod calls the underworld "the dank house of chilly Hades," a place where its inhabitants have "left behind the bright light of the sun" (Hesiod, *Op.* 153, 155 [Most, LCL]). Virgil, writing centuries later, speaks similarly about Hades describing it as a "sad, sunless dwelling" (*Aen.* 6.534).

¹⁵³ For more examples of afterlife utopias and music, see Lucian, *Ver. hist.* 2.5, 15; Plato, *Resp.* 617B–C; Cicero, *Resp.* 6.18.

¹⁵⁴ Regarding the mention of light on ancient Greco-Roman epitaphs, Bremmer writes, "In pagan epitaphs light plays on the whole a very limited role as a dominant characteristic of the hereafter" (*Rise and Fall*, 60).

With Pindar, the Orphics, and the earliest statements about the possibility of a blessed afterlife, the *topos* of light is used to express the blessedness of the afterlife utopia. Pindar, for example, speaking of the blessed in Hades states, "For them shines the might of the sun below during nighttime up here" (*fr.* 129 [Race, LCL]).¹⁵⁵ Similarly, he says that the blessed afterlife for the righteous will have "the sun shining for evermore, for equal nights and equal days" (*Ol.* 2.61–62 [Race, LCL]). Perhaps alluding to this example, Iambulus describes a primitivistic island near Arabia in which days and nights are of equal length.¹⁵⁶

One final example of a light motif in utopia comes from Lucian's *True Story*. In his grand description of the blessed afterlife he states that "it is neither night among them nor yet very bright day, but the light which is on the country is like the gray morning toward dawn, when the sun has not yet risen" (2.12 [Harmon, LCL]). There is no true parallel to Lucian's use of light in utopia, and he may be improvising here. It is also possible that he is playing on the "grayness" of the afterlife echoing Homeric descriptions of Hades.¹⁵⁷

¹⁵⁵ This statement also has cosmological significance. That the sun rotates around the earth and shines in Hades when not shining on the earth is a concept rarely found in the ancient world but clearly evident here.

¹⁵⁶ See Diodorus Siculus, 2.56.7. There is a competing tradition that suggests the length of days and nights is not equivalent, but instead there are six months of night and six months of days. Pliny is a good example. Though Pliny was not a primitivist and was more "scientific" in his methodology, he nevertheless has something to say about the classic primitivistic group, the Hyperboreans. As their name suggests, the Hyperboreans were believed to live "beyond the north wind." For this reason, Pliny, who is more concerned with cosmological accuracy than with fanciful descriptions of utopian societies, suggests that the Hyperboreans live where the sun shines for six months straight followed by six months of darkness (*Nat.* 4.26; see also Pomponius Mela, *Chorographia* 3.36–37; cf. 3.57). Pliny believed in a spherical earth and had a relatively advanced understanding of the sun's rotation, despite falling into the trap of a geocentric universe (see *Nat.* 2.64). Nevertheless, he says the average person did not believe as he did (see *Nat.* 2.65). Perhaps because of his own travels to the north, Pliny rightly understood that as one travels north, the ratio of darkness to light changes with a season of long days and a season of long nights (*Nat.* 16.1–2). Cf. Bridgman, *Hyperboreans*, 60–65.

¹⁵⁷ Other uses of a light motif in the afterlife include Virgil, *Aen.* 6.640; Valerius Flaccus, *Argon.* 1.842; Aristophanes, *Ran.* 455. Cf. Bremmer, *Rise and Fall*, 124.

For a primitivistic example, Diodorus Siculus pays particular attention to lighting in his description of the island of Nysa. He writes: "The entrance into the island is like a glen at its beginning, being thickly shaded by lofty trees growing close together, so that the sun never shines at all through the close-set branches but only the radiance of its light may be seen" (3.68.4 [Oldfather, LCL]).

2.3.10. *Climate*

Greco-Roman expectations concerning ideal temperature and precipitation play into their expectations of utopia's climate. This *topos* appears with some frequency in utopian descriptions. Lucian remarks that the citizens of the Island of the Blest "are acquainted with only one season of the year, for it is always spring there and the only wind that blows there is Zephyr" (2.12 [Harmon, LCL]).¹⁵⁸ Though Lucian does not explicitly mention the temperateness of the island, one can assume from the seasonal description and the description of the bounteous fruit that the island was indeed of a temperate climate.

In another example, Lucretius describes the heavenly abode of the gods as follows: "Before me appear the gods in their majesty, and their peaceful abodes, which no winds ever shake nor clouds besprinkle with rain, which no snow congealed by the bitter frost mars with its white fall, but the air ever cloudless encompasses them" (*De Rerum Natura* 3.18–22 [Rouse, LCL]).

Iambulus' description of a primitivistic island is similar, "Their climate is most temperate, we are told, considering that they live at the equator, and they suffer neither from heat nor from cold. . . . And with them the day is always the same length as the night, and at midday no shadow is cast of any object because the sun is in the zenith" (Diodorus Siculus, 2.56.7 [Oldfather, LCL]).¹⁵⁹ Since the temperature of a place is directly connected to the season, it is likely that the ancients saw it necessary to posit that the seasons did not change in utopia because the weather always remained temperate. It should also be mentioned that this *topos* works in tandem with the *topos* of bounteous fruit because good weather is necessary to produce much fruit. For this reason, the two are often found together.

In a final example from Diogenes, the Cynic philosopher, contemplates the issue of climate for everyday living:

He would choose localities that were healthful in preference to the unhealthy, and those that were adapted to the different seasons, and he took care to have a sufficient supply of food and moderate clothing. . . . He tried especially to imitate the life of the gods, for they alone, as Homer asserts, live at

¹⁵⁸ Aristoula Georgiadou and David H. J. Larmour (*Lucian's Science Fiction Novel True Histories: Interpretation and Commentary* [Leiden: Brill, 1998], 191–92) suggests that the zephyr is the wind associate with the month of March, thus emphasizing that it is spring-time. See Homer, *Od.* 4.567; Pindar, *Ol.* 2.78. The zephyr is also thought to be the wind that transports souls as is found in Apuleius, *Metam.* 4.35.

¹⁵⁹ For other examples, see Plato, *Phaed.* 111B; Pindar, *Ol.* 2.61–62.

ease, implying that the life of man is full of labour and hardship. Even the lower animals, he claimed, understand this sort of thing clearly. The storks, for example, leave the heat of the summer and migrate to a temperate climate, and after spending as long a time there as is most congenial to them, depart in flocks, retreating before the winter. . . . Deer and hares come down from the mountains in to the plains and valleys in the cold weather and find shelter there in comfortable nooks away from the wind, but in the hot season withdraw into the woods and the most northerly regions. (Dio Chrysostom, *Tyr.* 6.30–34 [Cohoon, LCL])

Dio Chrysostom states that by moving to temperate climates as the “lower animals” do, Diogenes would “imitate the life of the gods, for they alone, as Homer asserts, live at ease” (*Tyr.* 6.31 [Cohoon, LCL]). Though this comes from a political utopist, it is quite likely that this more appropriately belongs in the category of primitivistic utopianism. As mentioned in the first half of the chapter, it is doubtful that the Cynics adhered to or wrote about political utopianism, and this is a case where Diogenes exhibits characteristics more in line with primitivism than political utopianism. If this is the case, then the *topos* of climate does not appear as part of political utopianism.

2.3.11. *War and Peace*

Another widely found *topos* in utopian descriptions is the absence of war and the presence of peace.¹⁶⁰ Whether stories of the Golden Age, of primitive cultures on remote islands, or of afterlife to come, the presence of a peaceful society is a pervasive expectation.¹⁶¹ Yet despite the popularity of this *topoi* in utopian expectations, there are a few counter-examples that might suggest not all ancients expected war to be absent from utopia.

2.3.11.1. *War in Utopia*

Examples of war in utopia come from all three categories: two primitivistic utopia examples, an afterlife example, and a political utopia example.

¹⁶⁰ The following is a list of references to peace in primitivistic societies, the afterlife, and in the home of the gods. It is by no means exhaustive: Aratus, *Phaen.* 108–110; Aristotle, *Ath. Pol.* 16.7; Atheneus, *Deipn.* 6.268b; Diodorus Siculus, 2.55.4; 2.58.1; Hesiod, *Op.* 225; Homer, *Od.* 6.201–203; Horace, *Epod.* 16.151–152; Lucretius, *De Rerum Natura* 3.19; Ovid, *Metam.* 1.93; 125–27; Pindar, *Pyth.* 10.37–44; Plato, *Laws* 678D–679E; Pliny, *Nat.* 4.12.89; Plutarch, *Sertorius* 9.1; Ps.-Seneca, *Octavia* 400; Tibullus, *Elegies* 1.3.47–48; 1.10.7, 49–50; Virgil, *Aen.* 8.324–327; *Ecl.* 4.23–24.

¹⁶¹ William W. Tarn, and Guy T. Griffith, *Hellenistic Civilisation*, (3rd ed.; London: Edward Arnold, 1952), 80–91, 122; Dawson, *Cities of the Gods*, 20–21; Evans, *Utopia Antiqua*, 154–69.

Caesar describes the primitive society of the Germans who contain some utopian elements, though peacefulness is not one of them. He states that “their whole life is composed of hunting expeditions and military pursuits; from early boyhood they are zealous for toil and hardship” (*Bell. gall.* 6.21 [Edwards, LCL]). Caesar’s description can certainly be classified as “hard primitivism” because of the harshness of the realities the Germans must face. Because of this, it should not be entirely surprising if one finds that some elements of this “utopia” do not jibe with other utopian expectations. Similarly, Strabo also tells of a hard primitivistic group, the Albanians, who possess a number of utopian elements, such as a lack of nautical and agricultural technology, natural fecundity, a desirable climate, no coinage, and they are described as unusually handsome and large (*Geog.* 11.4.1–8). Though Strabo describes them as “not ferocious” (11.4.1) and says they give “no forethought to war” (11.4.4), they nevertheless are equipped with a large army prepared to fight (11.4.5). Furthermore, they practice human sacrifice, an act Strabo describes in gruesome detail (11.4.7). Their violent nature is surprising given their otherwise utopian characteristics.

In his satirical description of the afterlife utopia of the Island of the Blessed, Lucian tells of a battle scene that supposedly takes place between the citizens of the island and those who are on another island in the place of punishment (*Ver. hist.* 2.23). Very little is said about the war; its leaders are named, an anecdote about Socrates is recorded, Homer is said to have written an account of the battle, and those on the Island of the Blessed were victorious. Why Lucian chooses to include this battle is unclear, but given the prevalence of the *topos* of peace in utopia and Lucian’s penchant for satire, it is quite possible that Lucian is intentionally upending traditional notions of utopia.

Finally, Plato’s political utopianism as found in both the *Republic* and *Laws* expects war to continue in his utopia.¹⁶² Rather than construct an alternative reality in which war is completely eradicated, Plato assumes that war is a necessary part of this world and constructs his ideal society in such a way that war and the means of dealing with war are essential aspects of societal functioning. Plato sets up a class structure in which the guardians, those specially trained for battle, are the ruling class. Dawson

¹⁶² For a helpful introduction to the necessity of war in Plato’s utopia see Dawson, *Cities of the Gods*, 81–87. He notes that scholars often ask why communism is placed in Plato’s utopia, but rarely why war is present (81).

suggests that Plato's insistence on creating a guardian class and retaining the expectation of war is because he has constructed his ideal city using Sparta as a model.¹⁶³ Plato's guardian class was meant to represent a relatively small percentage of the population and was to be live in separate living quarters from the rest of society. Plato's utopia, therefore, not only expects war to be present but needs war in order for his city to function properly.

2.3.11.2. *Peace in Utopia*

Despite these few challengers, the vast majority of utopian descriptions expect peace among the citizens of utopia. One interesting facet of this *topos* is the explanation given for how war and strife entered the world. Ancient Greco-Romans point to three issues in particular: the rise of technology, greed, and the killing of animals for food.

In general, most primitivists lamented technological advance, particularly nautical and agricultural advances.¹⁶⁴ Regarding the problematic nature of nautical technology, Aratus notes that in the Golden Age "the dangerous sea was far from their thoughts, and as yet no ships brought them livelihood from afar" (*Phaen.* 110–111 [Kidd]). Lucretius speaks of the "wicked art of navigation" (*improba naviregi ratio*) and laments this change in society (*De Rerum Natura* 5.999–1006). Seneca writes that "a great measure of peace would be granted to humans if the seas were closed" (*Nat.* 5.18.12 [Corcoran, LCL]).¹⁶⁵ Speaking of the Golden Age, Ovid remarks that "Not yet had the pine-tree, felled on its native mountains, descended thence into the watery plain to visit other lands; men knew no shores except their own" (*Metam.* 1.94–96 [Miller, LCL]). Similarly, Tibullus states that in the Golden Age, "Pine timbers then had not defied

¹⁶³ Dawson, *Cities of the Gods*, 81–82.

¹⁶⁴ For the problems associate with agricultural technology, see the *topos* "Food" (for examples, cf. Aeschylus, *frag.* 196; Lucretius, *De Rerum Natura* 5.933–936, 1448–1457; Ovid, *Am.* 3.8.35–44; *Metam.* 1.123–124; Ps.-Seneca, *Octavia* 406–16; Strabo, *Geog.* 11.4.3; Tibullus, *Elegies* 1.3.35–48; Virgil, *Aen.* 8.313–318; *Georg.* 1.126–127; *Ecl.* 4.37–45). For decline through technology in general, see Aeschylus, *Prom.* 436–506; Lucretius, *De Rerum Natura* 5.1448–1457; Strabo, *Geog.* 7.3.7. See Lovejoy and Boas for a description of the technological state of nature (*Primitivism*, 14).

¹⁶⁵ Seneca is also capable of recognizing the good that comes from the seas. He states that without the wind, humans would be "an unschooled animal without wide experience of things if they were confined within the limits of their native soil" (*Nat.* 5.18.14 [Corcoran, LCL]). Despite some nuance, Seneca typically has a negative attitude toward navigation (e.g. *Medea* 301–308). For a discussion of the ambivalence in Seneca, see Romm (*Edges of the Earth*, 165–71).

blue waves or spread billowing canvas to the winds. No roving sailor seeking profit from strange lands had freighted ship with foreign merchandise. . . . Anger and armies and war were not yet known" (*Elegies* 1.3.37–40, 47 [Lee]).¹⁶⁶

Secondly, the desire for wealth is another way that primitivists often suggest war entered the world.¹⁶⁷ Ovid states that it was during the Iron Age that humans began to plumb the depths of the earth in order to mine its wealth.

Not only did men demand of the bounteous fields the crops and sustenance they owed, but they delved as well into the very bowels of the earth; and the wealth which the creator had hidden away and buried deep amidst the very Stygian shades, was brought to light, wealth that pricks men on to crime. And now baneful iron had come, and gold more baneful than iron; war came, which fights with both, and brandished in its bloody hands the clashing arms. Men lived on plunder. (*Metam.* 1.137–144 [Miller, LCL])

Clearly for Ovid, the presence of gold, and its concomitant greed, has a profoundly negative impact on society. Similarly, the author of *Octavia* argues that one of the causes of humanity's fall from the Golden Age was its interest in gold: "Into its mother's bowels did that degenerate age intrude; it dug out heavy iron and gold, and soon did it arm savage hands for war" (Ps.-Seneca, 417–419 [Fitch, LCL]). For many, then, it was through greed and a desire for wealth that unrest first began.

The Cynic philosopher, Diogenes, also connected riches with war and strife. Dio Chrysostom, speaking of Diogenes, states:

When, therefore, he observed how other men were harassed throughout their whole lives, ever plotting against one another, ever encompassed by a thousand ills and never able to enjoy a moment's rest, nay, not even during the great festivals nor when they proclaimed a truce; and when he beheld that they did or suffered all this simply in order to keep themselves alive, and that their greatest fear was lest their so-called necessities should fail them, and how, furthermore, they planned and strove to leave great riches to their children, he marveled that he too did not do the like, but was the only independent man in the world, and that nobody else had any comprehension of his own highest happiness. (*Tyr.* 6.34 [Corcoran, LCL])

¹⁶⁶ See also Ovid, *Am.* 3.8.35–44; *Metam.* 1.132–133; Strabo, *Geog.* 11.4.3; Virgil, *Georg.* 1.126–145; 3.141–142; Horace, *Carm.* 1.3; Seneca, *Medea* 301–339, 364–379; *Nat.* 5.18.5, 12. For secondary literature, see Romm, *Edges of the Earth*, 74, 163–71.

¹⁶⁷ Besides the examples given below, see also Plato, *Laws* 678D–679E; Justin, *Hist. Phil. epit.* 2.2; Virgil, *Aen.* 8.324–327. See also the discussion under the *topos* "Wealth" above.

Diogenes and the Cynic philosophers that followed him are known for disregarding possessions, and according to this passage, they do so in order that they may “attain peace.”

In an example from Diodorus Siculus’s description of the city of Thebes, he tells of a king of Egypt, Tnephachthus. The king travelled to Arabia and, after having a conversion experience of sorts, denounced luxury for himself and all of Egypt. The result, according to Diodorus Siculus, was that fifty two descendants ruled in an unbroken succession for a period of one thousand forty years, and “in their reigns nothing occurred that was worthy of record” (1.45.3 [Oldfather, LCL]). That for over a thousand years nothing “worthy of record” occurred could be taken as a slight against these kings and their reigns. Diodorus might be saying that these kings accomplished nothing in their very lengthy tenures as kings. On the other hand, it is more likely that Diodorus is praising these Egyptian kings. In a culture where technological progress is understood to be detrimental to society, a lack of “development” or “progress” is praiseworthy. More importantly, that nothing happened during these years means that no wars took place, no political upheaval happened, and no natural disasters causing large amounts of death occurred during this period. The connection that Diodorus seems to be making is that because this king denounced luxury and wealth, he and his descendants and their kingdoms lived in a state of peace.

A third way war and strife was believed to have entered the world was through the killing of animals. Vegetarianism, therefore, is popular among utopian expectations, particularly in primitivistic utopias.¹⁶⁸ As examples of cultural primitivism, Ferguson mentions the Rhizophagi, Spermatophagi, and Hylophagi described by Diodorus Siculus¹⁶⁹ and Homer’s Lotus-Eaters.¹⁷⁰ As an example of vegetarianism in the Golden Age, Aratus laments that it was during the Bronze Age that humans first began to eat the oxen that did the plowing, indicating some kind of vegetarianism in prior ages.¹⁷¹ Ovid has quite a lot to say about the importance of

¹⁶⁸ Ferguson, *Utopias*, 18. See also, Roy Walker, *The Golden Feast: A Perennial Theme in Poetry* (London: Rockliff, 1952); Johannes Haussleiter, *Der Vegetarismus in der Antike* (Religionsgeschichtliche Versuche und Vorarbeiten 24; Berlin: Alfred Topelmann, 1935); Daniel A. Dombrowski, *The Philosophy of Vegetarianism* (Amherst, Mass.: University of Massachusetts Press, 1984).

¹⁶⁹ Diodorus Siculus, 3.15–23 ff. See Ferguson, *Utopias*, 18.

¹⁷⁰ Homer, *Od.* 9.82–105.

¹⁷¹ Aratus, *Phaen.* 132. Ferguson suggests that Hesiod’s account of the five ages of humanity also introduces meat eating in the Bronze Age. This, however, is not in the text.

vegetarianism, connecting it to the Golden Age.¹⁷² Even more importantly, he discusses vegetarianism in light of his beliefs about the immortality of the soul. He believes the soul can be reincarnated into animal form, and, therefore, if one eats an animal, he may be eating a “kindred soul.” Porphyry reports that Dicaerchus, a late fourth-, early third-century student of Aristotle, believed “the ancients were born close to the gods: they were best in nature and lived the best kind of life, so as to be reckoned a race of gold in comparison with those of the present day who are made from base and valueless matter; and they kill no animate being” (Porphyry, *Abst.* 4.2.1 [Clark]). Linking the killing of animals to the introduction of war into society, Porphyry goes on to say: “Later the pastoral way of life came in, and in this people were already surrounding themselves with excess possessions and laying hands on animals, having realized that some did no damage, but others were harmful and fierce. So they tamed the first and attacked the second; and together with this way of life war arose. . . . [R]esearch, and experience tell us that luxury, war and injustice came in together with the slaughter of animals” (4.2.7, 9).¹⁷³

There are a number of exceptions to the trend of vegetarianism. Athenaeus, for example, cites poets of the “old comedy” from the fifth century BCE who speak of the Golden Age as having rivers of “broth, whirling hot slices of meat,” “whole hams,” “roasted kid guts,” and “lumps of meat” rolling through the street.¹⁷⁴ Similarly with regard to cultural primitivism, Iambulus’ Island of the Sun describes a utopian people who eat meat. He is very particular about their diet:

All the details of their diet, we are told, follow a prescribed arrangement, since they do not all take their food at the same time nor is it always the same; but it has been ordained that on certain fixed days they shall eat at one time fish, at another time fowl, sometimes the flesh of land animals, and sometimes olives and the most simple side-dishes. (Diodorus Siculus, 2.59.5–6 [Oldfather, LCL])

Hesiod says that the Bronze Age does not eat bread, but says nothing of meat (*Op.* 143–155; Ferguson, *Utopias*, 18). Ferguson is right, however, that Hesiod goes on to praise those who live on acorns and honey (*Op.* 233).

¹⁷² Ovid, *Metam.* 15.60–175.

¹⁷³ See also Lucretius, *De Rerum Natura* 5.1418–1425; Ps.-Seneca, *Octavia* 406–416.

¹⁷⁴ Athenaeus, *Deipn.* 6.268c, 268e, 269d, and 269e respectively. Athenaeus provides a clear exception to Evans’ statement that “the Golden Race is never depicted as meat-eating,” (*Utopia Antiqua*, 153). Also, the description of eating meat during Saturnalia is another possible counter example (Lucian, *Sat.* 17).

Diodorus Siculus also describes an unnamed utopian island that lies outside the pillars of Hercules whose inhabitants are clearly not vegetarians. He states that “there is excellent hunting of every manner of beast and wild animal, and the inhabitants, being well supplied with this game at their feasts, lack of nothing which pertains to luxury and extravagance” (5.19.4 [Oldfather, LCL]). Along these lines, it is perhaps notable that during Saturnalia, a time when the world is supposed to be returned to the Golden Age, meat is eaten.¹⁷⁵ The eating of meat, then, is something that is sometimes found in utopian societies.¹⁷⁶ Nevertheless, for some ancient Greco-Romans, it is through the killing of animals that war and strife enter the world.

Peace was perceived to be essential for a well-functioning society. As Baldry states, “The belief that *φιλία*, avoidance of *στάσις*, is the key to the lasting happiness of the community, is implicit in nearly every Greek political thinker and a commonplace in Plato and Aristotle.”¹⁷⁷ Even Plato, whose elevation of the guardian class showed that he expected war in utopia, states that “the highest good . . . is neither war nor civil strife—which things we should pray rather to be saved from—but peace one with another and friendly feeling” (*Laws* 628C [Bury, LCL]).¹⁷⁸

One way ancients attempted to preserve peace and avoid strife was through the practice of the community of wives and children.¹⁷⁹ In the primitive society described by Iambulus, certain steps were taken in order to ensure peace. He states:

They do not marry, we are told, but possess their children in common, and maintaining the children who are born as if they belonged to all, they love them equally; and while the children are infants those who suckle the babes often change them around in order that not even the mothers may know their own offspring. Consequently, since there is no rivalry among them, they never experience civil disorders and they never cease placing

¹⁷⁵ Lucian, *Sat.* 17.

¹⁷⁶ Other examples could include Plato (*Laws* 678E) who describes a chronological primitivism with meat, and an afterlife with meat and fish (*Resp.* 363C). Strabo (*Geog.* 11.4.3), in describing the Albanians, a primitivistic group, speaks of them as eating meat. Tacitus’ description of the Germans emphasizes the value they place on their animals though he does not directly state that they eat them, though this is a safe assumption (*Germ.* 5). Virgil describes Italy’s glories, at times using utopian language, but does not shy away from mentioning the abundance of flocks and cattle (*Georg.* 2.136–176).

¹⁷⁷ Baldry, “Zeno’s Ideal State,” 14.

¹⁷⁸ Cf. Aristotle, *Eth. nic.* 8.1155a22.

¹⁷⁹ For more, see above under the *topos* “Wealth and Communism.”

the highest value upon internal harmony. (Diodorus Siculus, 2.58.1 [Oldfather, LCL])

The community of wives and children, then, is an institution meant to disarm “rivalry” and “civil disorder.” Doron Mendels points to this passage as an example of *ὁμόνοια*, or harmony, which he says is a “commonplace slogan in the Hellenistic era.”¹⁸⁰ Herodotus, for example, says that Agathyrsi practice a community of wives for this very purpose (*Hist.* 4.104).

The “community of wives” (*κοινωνία γυναικῶν*), as noted above, was also a popular motif among writers of political utopianism. Plato is most well known for this ideal, though Zeno and Diogenes equally agree.¹⁸¹ The purpose of this ideal for philosophers was the same as that of Iambulus, peace and concord. Baldry notes that “Zeno, like Plato and others, saw *κοινωνία γυναικῶν* as a means to harmony within the state, which would thereby remain undisturbed by family rivalries or jealousy.”¹⁸² The purpose, then, of the community of wives among primitivists and political utopian thinkers alike was *ὁμόνοια*, or harmony. Internal harmony and peace among the social order is an integral part of the *topos* of war and peace.

Though there are a few examples that suggest war might be present in utopia, the overwhelming majority of the evidence suggests that peace is the ideal. The evidence points to three popular ways war was said to have entered the world: through technology, through greed, or through the killing of animals. Each of these has a considerable amount of support. Finally, one other oft-proposed means for the promotion of peace and civil order is a community of wives. Such a “utopia” is likely to be utopian for only half of a community’s population.

2.3.12. *Citizens*

Moving from a description of place to a description of people, it is worth asking: Who inhabits utopia? And what is the character of the citizens of utopia? After noting the similarities and differences in how each category of utopianism answers these questions, the description of this *topos* will then move to the concomitant issue of the body in utopia answering the

¹⁸⁰ Mendels, “Hellenistic Utopia and the Essenes,” 211. Cf. Tarn and Griffith, *Hellenistic Civilisation*, 80–91, 122; Dawson, *Cities of the Gods*, 20–21; Evans, *Utopia Antiqua*, 154–169.

¹⁸¹ For Diogenes, see Diogenes Laertius, *Lives* 6.20; for Zeno, see Diogenes Laertius, *Lives* 7.33, 131.

¹⁸² Baldry, “Zeno’s Ideal State,” 9.

question, What did ancient Greco-Romans expect regarding bodily existence in both primitivistic utopias and the afterlife?

2.3.12.1. *Inhabitants*

Political utopianism is particularly interested in the character of the citizens who inhabit the ideal society. Not just anyone can be part of the ideal society. In Zeno's *Republic*, for example, Zeno argues that it is only the virtuous and the wise that can be "true citizens." About Zeno, Diogenes Laertius writes:

He applies to all men who are not virtuous [σπουδαίος] the opprobrious epithets of foemen, enemies, slaves, and aliens to one another, parents to children, brothers to brothers, friends to friends.

Again, in the *Republic*, making an invidious contrast, he declares the good [σπουδαίος] alone to be true citizens or friends or kindred or free men; and accordingly in the view of the Stoics parents and children are enemies, not being wise [σοφός]. (*Lives* 7.32–33 [Hicks, LCL])

For Zeno, then, the distinguishing marks that determined who was fit to be a citizen of his ideal city had nothing to do with birth but with virtue and wisdom. In the same way, Plutarch, though critiquing the philosophers for being men of words rather than deeds, nevertheless, suggests that "virtue and internal harmony" are the foundations of the ideal cities of Plato, Diogenes, and Zeno.¹⁸³

Regarding primitivistic utopianism, ancient Greco-Roman authors had much to say about the kinds of people who inhabit utopia. Most commonly, primitive people were thought to be especially just. It is out of this preconception that the idea of the "noble savage" is borne.¹⁸⁴ Perhaps the most frequent example is the epithet "blameless" that is frequently attached to the Ethiopians, a primitivistic group living at the world's edge.¹⁸⁵ Regarding the Hyperboreans, Romm notes, "In many ways the Hyperboreans can be seen as mirror-image counterparts to the Ethiopians, inhabiting the northern edge of the world rather than the southern."¹⁸⁶ As with the Ethiopians, the Hyperboreans are both known for their

¹⁸³ Plutarch, *Lyc.* 3.2.

¹⁸⁴ See discussion above under "Primitivistic Utopianism." For a tremendous list of ancient texts that exemplify the expectation of the noble savage, see Lovejoy and Boas, *Primitivism*, 287–367.

¹⁸⁵ For Ethiopians at the "end of the world," see Homer, *Od.* 1.23; *Il.* 1.423.

¹⁸⁶ Romm, *Edges of the Earth*, 60. However, see Bridgman for a modest critique of Romm on this point (*Hyperboreans*, 71).

justness and their presence among the gods.¹⁸⁷ Similarly, Strabo notes that the prevailing assumption about the Scythians is that they are a just people untouched by the corrupting culture of the Greeks (*Geog.* 7.3.9).¹⁸⁸ To this list of virtuous peoples who live in remote places could be added the Arcadians,¹⁸⁹ the Albanians,¹⁹⁰ and the Germans.¹⁹¹

As noted in the introduction to afterlife utopianism, the nature of the afterlife in Greco-Roman thought develops over time. Hesiod, for example, reserves the afterlife for the race of heroes. He does not expect to find the average person entering the Islands of the Blessed; in fact, he indicates that not even all of the heroes made it to the islands. The expectation for Hesiod, then, was that upon death one would enter Hades and live a shadowy existence.¹⁹² By the time of Pindar in the early fifth century BCE, the Islands of the Blessed had become a place that was accessible to a larger population, though not without considerable requirements. He states, "Whosoever, while dwelling in either world, have thrice been courageous in keeping their souls pure from all deeds of wrong [ἀδίκων], pass by the highway of Zeus unto the tower of Cronus, where the ocean-breezes blow around the Islands of the Blest" (*Ol.* 2.68–71 [Race, LCL]). It seems that Pindar's understanding of the afterlife is that after one dies, one is sent to be judged in Hades and, if righteous, is sent to Elysium.¹⁹³ This person, however, must then return twice more to earth, a total of three incarnations, and be judged righteous twice more.¹⁹⁴ Once judged the final time, the person is then considered a hero and sent to the Islands of the Blessed with the heroes of Hesiod.¹⁹⁵ For Pindar, then, righteousness is something that must be attained three times over and only then is an individual considered a hero and worthy of the blessed afterlife.

¹⁸⁷ Pindar, *Pyth.* 10.34–44.

¹⁸⁸ For more on the virtuous nature of the primitive peoples, see Romm, *Edges of the Earth*, 45–81.

¹⁸⁹ Polybius, *Hist.* 4.19–21.

¹⁹⁰ Strabo, *Geog.* 11.4.1–5.

¹⁹¹ Seneca, *De providentia* 4.14–15; *Ira* 2.15.

¹⁹² For a description of Hades that would likely have been similar to Hesiod's understanding of the afterlife for the average person, see Homer, *Od.* 11.1–640.

¹⁹³ See *Dirges frag.* 129.

¹⁹⁴ Plato also mentions three incarnations of a person before one can enter a final resting place of bliss (*Phaedr.* 249A). It is possible that both Pindar and Plato are here taking their cues from the Pythagoreans, though no extant document states how many reincarnations were expected by the Pythagoreans. Nevertheless, Bremmer argues that the Pythagorean reincarnation was influential to both Pindar and Plato (Bremmer, *Rise and Fall*, 12).

¹⁹⁵ See *Dirges frag.* 133.

From Pindar forward the requirement of righteousness in order to enter the blessed afterlife becomes a common trope in Greco-Roman literature.¹⁹⁶ As Manuel and Manuel write, “Whereas in Homer Elysium had been the predestined lot of a few humans who were transported there as relatives of the gods, in Pindar the Islands of the Blessed became the reward for a life of struggle and of overcoming sin. It coexisted with Hades where the wicked were tormented.”¹⁹⁷ In both Hesiod and Homer, the realm of Hades is not primarily used as a prison for torture as it appears in later (particularly Christian) tradition.¹⁹⁸

Using Hesiod’s description of the golden race as a starting point, Plato argues that the golden race still exists in those who are especially honorable. Hesiod clearly states that “the earth covered up this race,”¹⁹⁹ but Plato argues otherwise. In typical Socratic fashion he states the following:

“Of those who die on campaign, if anyone’s death has been especially glorious, shall we not, to begin with, affirm that he belongs to the golden race?”
 “By all means.” “And shall we not believe Hesiod who tells us that when anyone of this race dies, so it is that they become

Hallowed spirits [οἱ δαίμονες] dwelling on earth, averters of evil,
 Guardians watchful and good of articulate speaking mortals?”

“We certainly shall believe him.” (*Resp.* 468E–469A [Shorey, LCL])

For Plato, then, the fate of the golden race is something able to be obtained by those not of the golden race. As with Pindar, however, there is the requirement of righteousness and piety. In the *Phaedo*, Plato gives a vivid description of what happens upon death (113D–114C). He says that each person is led to judgment where they are then sentenced by whether “they have lived well and piously [δσίως], or not” (113D [Fowler, LCL]; cp. *Gorg.* 523A–B). At this point, there are then two paths, one for the pious and one for the impious. The impious are not simply thrown into Hell or Tartarus never to be seen again; they are first judged to be either curable or incurable, the incurable being sent to Tartarus “where they never emerge,” and the curable being sent to a purgatory where they are given the chance to be regenerated.

¹⁹⁶ Some examples include Horace, *Epod.* 16.63–66; Lucian, *Cat.* 24–28; Plato, *Phaed.* 108C; 113D; 114B; *Resp.* 614C ff.; 619B.

¹⁹⁷ Frank E. Manuel and Fritzie P. Manuel, *Utopian Thought in the Western World* (Cambridge, Mass.: The Belknap Press, 1979), 77.

¹⁹⁸ Nevertheless, Homer’s Hades is not completely without punishment, though this appears to be the exception to the rule (*Od.* 11.576–640).

¹⁹⁹ *Op.* 122.

The pious, on the other hand, are those who have “excelled in holy living [τὸ ὁσίως βιῶναι]” (*Resp.* 114B; cp. *Gorg.* 525C, 526B). These people are freed from the regions inside the earth, move upward on the earth, “and all who have duly purified themselves by philosophy live henceforth altogether without bodies, and pass to still more beautiful abodes which it is not easy to describe, nor have we now time enough” (114C).

2.3.12.2. *Judgment in the Afterlife*

On the issue of judgment, Plato notes that the soul is judged after the body and soul have been separated from one another upon death (*Gorg.* 524B). He then states,

When a man’s soul is stripped bare of the body, all its natural gifts, and the experiences added to that soul as the result of his various pursuits, are manifest in it. So when they have arrived in the presence of their judge, they of Asia before Rhadamanthus, these Rhadamanthus sets before him and surveys the soul of each, not knowing whose it is; nay, often when he has laid hold of the Great King or some other prince or potentate, he perceives the utter unhealthiness of his soul, striped all over with the scourge, and a mass of wounds, the work of perjuries and injustice; where every act has left its smirch upon his soul, where all is awry through falsehood and imposture, and nothing straight because of a nurture that knew not truth: or, as the result of a course of license, luxury, insolence, and incontinence, he finds the soul full fraught with disproportion and ugliness. (*Gorg.* 524D–525A [Lamb, LCL])

That the soul retains the marks of one’s life is a theme picked up by other ancient authors as well. Notably, Virgil gives a similar description of judgment and purgation as that of Plato. In the sixth book of the *Aeneid*, Aeneas is in Hades and has found his way to Elysium where Anchises acts as his guide, explaining what he is seeing. Of the judgment scene he is witnessing, Anchises explains,

When life’s last ray has fled, the wretches are not entirely freed from all evil and all the plagues of the body; and it needs must be that many a taint, long ingrained, should in wondrous wise become deeply rooted in their being. Therefore are they schooled with punishments, and pay penance for bygone sins. Some are hung stretched out to the empty winds; from others the stain of guilt is washed away under swirling floods or burned out by fire till length of days, when time’s cycle is complete, has removed the inbred taint and leaves unsoiled the ethereal sense and pure flame of spirit: each of us undergoes his own purgatory. Then we are sent to spacious Elysium, a few of us to possess the blissful fields. All these that you see, when they have rolled time’s wheel through a thousand years, the god summons in vast throng to Lethe’s river, so that, their memories effaced, they may once more

revisit the vault above and conceive the desire of return to the body. (*Aen.* 6.735–751 [Fairclough, LCL])

Virgil's debt to Plato is quite clear in a number of ways. First, the expectation that cleansing in purgatory might be required even for those who going on to Elysium is similar to Plato. Both understand judgment in terms of the judgment of one's soul, and it is the "taint" of guilt left on the soul that must be atoned for. In his *Republic*, Plato even states that the souls in purgatory are "full of squalor and dust" while those who have passed through to a blessed afterlife have "clean and pure" souls (*Resp.* 614D). Both Plato and Virgil provide a space for that atonement and require complete purity before one can enter Elysium. Second, the idea of a thousand-year waiting period is also Platonic. Plato calls the life after death "that journey of a thousand years."²⁰⁰ Third, both Plato and Virgil expect reincarnation following the thousand-year period. On this third point, one should note that Pindar precedes Plato in promoting a similar understanding of reincarnation.²⁰¹

In a final example, Lucian tells a story in which three people come before the judgment seat of Rhadamanthus. Rhadamanthus tells the first, Cyniscus, to strip himself, "so that I can judge you from the marks on your back. . . . For every wicked deed that each of you has done in his life he bears an invisible mark on his soul" (*Cat.* 24 [Harmon, LCL]). Lucian is here standing in a tradition that includes both Plato and Virgil. Lucian's nod to Plato is even clearer when we read that Cyniscus admits, "I was a wicked man through ignorance and earned many marks thereby; but no sooner had I begun to be a philosopher than I gradually washed away all the scars from my soul" (*Cat.* 24). That one can cleanse the soul through philosophy is Platonic as noted above in a quote from the *Phaedo*. The next man to pass before Rhadamanthus is a simple cobbler, Micyllus, who Rhadamanthus quickly passes on to the Island of the Blessed saying he is "quite clean and unmarked" (*Cat.* 25). Finally, Rhadamanthus prosecutes Megapenthes, a tyrant in charge of an unnamed city who did all sorts of unspeakable evils. When he is stripped bare before Rhadamanthus he is said to be "all livid and crisscrossed; indeed he is black and blue with marks" (*Cat.* 28). Rhadamanthus chooses to punish the man in an atypical fashion by not allowing him to drink the water of the river Lethe. By doing

²⁰⁰ *Resp.* 621D; cf. *Resp.* 615A; *Phaedr.* 249A.

²⁰¹ *Dirges frag.* 129.

this, the man will be tortured by his own memories of how good his life once was as compared to how terrible it will be in the afterlife.

The expectation, then, that one would be judged in the afterlife was prevalent in the Greco-Roman world. Starting with Pindar, and perhaps even before with the Pythagoreans, one's actions in this life determined one's lot in the afterlife. Righteousness, virtue, and wisdom, therefore, were all characteristics that were required of those entering the blessed afterlife.

2.3.12.3. *Utopian Bodies*

Another issue related to people in utopia is that of bodies in utopia. What are the expectations regarding bodily existence? Both afterlife utopianism and primitivistic utopianism take up this trope.²⁰²

The view of all Hellenistic and Roman authors is that the afterlife will be a bodiless place. Even with Homer does one find an expectation that only the soul survives death. It is the soul, therefore, that journeys to Hades and the underworld. Thus in the *Odyssey*, when Odysseus makes his way to Hades, Homer describes Odysseus' encounter with his deceased mother as follows:

So she spoke, and I wondered in my heart how I might clasp the ghost of my dead mother. Three times I sprang toward her, and my will said, "Clasp her," and three times she flitted from my arms like a shadow or a dream. As for me, the pain grew ever sharper in my heart, and I spoke and addressed her with winged words:

"My mother, why do you not stay for me when I wish to clasp you, so that even in the house of Hades we two may throw our arms about each other and take our fill of chill lamenting. Is this some phantom that august Persephone has sent me so that I may lament and groan still more?"

So I spoke, and my honored mother at once answered: "Ah me, my child, ill-fated above all men, it is not that Persephone, daughter of Zeus, is deceiving you, but this is the appointed way with mortals, when one dies. For the sinews no longer hold the flesh and the bones together, but the strong force of blazing fire destroys these, as soon as the spirit leaves the white bones, and the ghost [ψυχή], like a dream, flutters off and is gone." (*Od.* 11.204–222 [Murray, LCL]; cf. 10.494–495; 11.82–83)

Homer uses the words "ghost" (ψυχή), "shadow" (σκιά), "dream" (ὄνειρος), and "phantom" (εἰδωλον) to describe the afterlife "bodies," which are in

²⁰² Perhaps for obvious reasons, politically utopianism is silent.

fact no bodies at all.²⁰³ Corporeal existence ends upon death, and one's body is buried in the ground. It is the soul (ψυχή) that continues.

Virgil's afterlife is similar to Homer's. When Aeneas meets his father Anchises in Elysium, he wishes to embrace him, but because only souls make it to the afterlife and not corporeal bodies, Aeneas' attempts fail. Virgil writes, "Thrice there he strove to throw his arms about his neck; thrice the form, vainly clasped, fled from his hands, even as light winds, and most like a winged dream" (*Aen.* 6.699–702 [Fairclough, LCL]). That Virgil is echoing Homer is evident in that both heroes meet a parent in the afterlife, both try three times to embrace their parent, and both use the language of "dream" to describe the nature of their experience.

In the *True Story*, Lucian describes the bodies of the residents of the Island of the Blessed as follows:

As for themselves, they have no bodies, but are intangible and fleshless, with only shape and figure. Incorporeal as they are, they nevertheless live and move and think and talk. In a word, it would appear that their naked souls (ψυχή) go about in the semblance of their bodies. Really, if one did not touch them, he could not tell that what he saw was not a body, for they are like upright shadows (σκιαι), only not black. (*Ver. hist.* 2.12 [Harmon, LCL])

This description has similarities with Homers' description in that the bodies are not corporeal but are described as "souls" (ψυχή) and "shadows" (σκιαι).²⁰⁴ For those entering utopia, whether Lucian's Island of the Blessed, Virgil's Elysium, or any other Greco-Roman utopia, one should expect a form unlike the bodily existence experienced in this world. The expectation is of a shadowy soul unable to be grasped or touched.

Primitivistic utopias are not without comment regarding the bodies of primitive peoples.²⁰⁵ In contrast to the afterlife utopias in which there are no bodies but souls alone, primitivistic utopianism focused on the living and thus a bodied people. Nevertheless, these bodies tended to be quite different from the average person's. The people of Iambulus' Island of the Sun are exemplary:

The dwellers upon this island differ greatly both in the characteristics of their bodies and in their manners from the men in our part of the inhabited world; for they are all nearly alike in the shape of their bodies and are over

²⁰³ Elsewhere Homer again uses *shadow* (σκιά) and *phantom* (εἶδωλον) as the descriptors for the people of the afterlife (*Od.* 10.494–495; 11.82–83).

²⁰⁴ See also *Cat.* 24–28.

²⁰⁵ See Ferguson, *Utopias*, 17–18.

four cubits in height, but the bones of the body have the ability to bend to a certain extent and then straighten out again, like the sinewy parts. They are also exceedingly tender in respect to their bodies and yet more vigorous than is the case among us; for when they have seized any object in their hands no man can extract it from the grasp of their fingers. There is absolutely no hair on any part of their bodies except on the head, eyebrows and eyelids, and on the chin, but the other parts of the body are so smooth that not even the least down can be seen on them. They are also remarkably beautiful and well-proportioned in the outline of the body. The openings of their ears are much more spacious than ours and growths have developed that serve as valves, so to speak, to close them. (Diodorus Siculus, 2.56.2–4 [Oldfather, LCL])

Iambulus goes on to describe their tongues, with which they are capable of holding two conversations at one time. Such fanciful descriptions, however, are the very tales Lucian mocks in his *True Story*. He even mentions Iambulus by name as someone after whom he is modeling his own tall tale. He says that Iambulus “made up a falsehood that is patent to everybody, but wrote a story that is not uninteresting for all that” (*Ver. hist.* 1.3). Nevertheless, the idea that primitive peoples, both chronological and cultural, had superior bodies to the average person was common though less exaggerated than Iambulus’ description.²⁰⁶

In conclusion, bodily existence in the afterlife was not typically expected. Instead, through the influence of Pythagoreanism and Pindar through Platonic philosophy, the soul was expected to be separated from the body upon death at which point the soul would continue into the afterlife. A form of this is even found as early as Homer’s understanding of Hades. In primitivistic utopias, it is a common belief that primitive peoples have superior bodies when compared to the average person.

2.3.13. *Work*

Generally speaking, the Greco-Roman expectation regarding work in utopia is that, simply put, there is none.²⁰⁷ This can be seen in the presence

²⁰⁶ Diodorus Siculus, 5.19.3; Herodotus, *Hist.* 3.20; Lucretius, *De Rerum Natura* 5.925–932; Pindar, *Pyth.* 10.41; Pliny, *Nat.* 4.12; 6.13; Scylax, *Periplus* 112; Strabo, *Geog.* 11.4.4; Tacitus, *Germ.* 46.

²⁰⁷ See Aeschylus, *frag.* 196; Atheneus, *Deip.* 6.267f–269c; Hesiod, *Op.* 90–92, 109–126, 225–237; Homer, *Od.* 4.561–569; Horace, *Epod.* 16.39–66; Lucian, *Sat.* 7, 13, 20; *Ver. hist.* 2.14; Ovid, *Metam.* 1.89–112; Pindar, *Ol.* 2.55–67; *Pyth.* 10.37–44; Plutarch, *Sertorius* 8.2–3; Strabo, *Geog.* 3.2.13; 11.4.4; Virgil, *Ecl.* 4.18–25; *Georg.* 2.177–194.

A counter example to those mentioned above is the description of the Pancheans in Diodorus Siculus, a culture that clearly has marks of soft primitivism and yet has a caste

of natural fecundity in which the land does the work that people typically do. It can also be seen in one articulation of the river *topos* in which rivers provides food or drink without the work that is typically required in its production. The following example is from Horace:

So let us seek the Blessed Fields and Wealthy Isles, where every year the land unploughed gives grain, and vines unpruned are never out of flower, and olive shoots unfailing bud, and set their fruit, and dusky fig ungrafted graces its own tree, the honey flows from hollow ilex, and from hills the streamlet lightly leaps with sounding footfall. There to the milking pails unbidden come the goats, and friendly flocks their swollen udders bring. (*Epod.* 16.42–50 [West])

In utopia, the work that is typically required for daily sustenance is eliminated. In Horace's vision, the farmer no longer has to toil in planting seeds or rounding up goats and cattle. All of this is done for him.

In a more comical example of this *topos*, Athenaeus depicts utopia as a place where utensils and furniture walk, barley-cakes and fish respond to commands, and trees grow leaves of cuttle fish and boiled thrush.²⁰⁸ Similarly, Lucian recognizes that there is a problem if servants exist in utopia because it would not be utopia for them. He, therefore, has the wind and the trees act as the servants of utopia.²⁰⁹

This *topos* is even found in hard primitivistic descriptions of utopia. Plutarch's description of the people of the Island of the Blessed is a good example:

They enjoy moderate rains at long intervals, and winds which for the most part are soft and precipitate dews, so that the islands no only have a rich soil which is excellent for plowing and planting, but also produce a natural fruit that is plentiful and wholesome enough to feed, without toil or trouble, a leisured folk. (*Sertorius* 8.2 [Perrin, LCL])

It is important to note that Plutarch's Island of the Blessed is not a fanciful place for those who enter the afterlife; it is merely a series of beautiful

system that divides the work among the citizens (5.45.3–4; cf. 6.1.5). Also, despite the absence of hard labor in most utopian descriptions, that does not necessarily indicate that nothing is happening. For example, in Homer's description of the Phaeacians he tells of their skill in boxing, wrestling, jumping, and foot racing (*Od.* 8.100–103). Similarly, Lucian's Island of the Blessed contains wrestling, boxing, foot racing, and poetry, perhaps a nod to Homer's description of the Phaeacians (*Ver. hist.* 2.22). See also Diodorus Siculus, 2.59.6; Homer, *Od.* 8.246–255; Lucian, *Sat.* 13.

²⁰⁸ *Deipn.* 6.267e–270a.

²⁰⁹ *Ver. hist.* 2.14.

islands in the Atlantic Ocean accessible to any skilled navigator.²¹⁰ And yet despite the hard primitivism of Plutarch, he still describes the people of this island as being “without toil or trouble, a leisured folk.”

Beyond the expectation that there will be no work in utopia, there is a related expectation that utopia will lack anxiety.²¹¹ It will be a stress-free society. Once again the interplay of other *topoi* can be seen here. Thus the presence of rivers can provide healing and relaxation, and the fragrant smells of paradise can provide an aroma-therapy, soothing the citizens and allowing them to enjoy life. The lack of anxiety is also enabled by the *topos* of peace and the lack of war as well a communistic economy in which all people share all things and no one goes without.²¹² And Porphyry connects low anxiety with the natural fecundity of the Golden Age stating: “This was also the reason why they had leisure and spent their time without effort and anxiety . . . and illness” (*Abst.* 4.2.4 [Clark]). In conclusion, the lack of work in utopia, combined with the presence of other *topoi*, leads to life of ease with little stress.

2.3.14. *Divine Presence*

The description of this final *topos* will address the question, Are the gods present in utopia? And if so, in what capacity? Rhiannon Evans claims that “the integration of gods and humans [is] a trope of the Golden Age and utopian societies.”²¹³ Exactly what she means by “integration,” however, is unclear. If what she means is that the gods come to visit humans in their utopian settings, then certainly this trope can be found in some primitivistic utopias as will be shown below. If she means that the gods come to live with humans and dwell with them as their own people, this is mistaken. Even among the most just peoples, the gods never settle down and live. They only visit. Before proceeding, it should be stated clearly that any expectation regarding gods visiting humans is found within primitivistic and afterlife utopias. Political utopianism does not employ this *topos*.

²¹⁰ Plutarch is not alone in this. Many ancients believed that the tradition of the Islands of the Blessed came from actual islands that exists somewhere in the Atlantic (see also Pomponius Mela, 3.102).

²¹¹ See Aratus, *Phaen.* 105–109; Aristotle, *Ath. Pol.* 16.7; Horace, *Carm.* 3.24.25–32; Lucretius, *De Rerum Natura* 3.23–24 (the gods); Pliny, *Nat.* 4.12.89; Virgil, *Ecl.* 4.11–25.

²¹² This, of course, assumes that their communistic society achieves the utopian goals it sets out to achieve. Whether or not communism can actually work is an issue this study is not suited to broach.

²¹³ Evans, *Utopia Antiqua*, 9.

Beginning with primitivistic utopianism, the Golden Age is said to be a time during which the human race was loved by the gods. The common trope appears as early as Hesiod (*Op.* 120) and continues throughout descriptions of the Golden Age.²¹⁴ In a similar fashion, Pausanias describes a scenario in which people of old “were guests of the gods, eating at the same board. . . . In those days men were changed to gods, who down to the present day have honours paid to them—Aristaeüs, Britomartis of Crete, Heracles the son of Alemena, Amphiaräus the son of Oicles, and besides these Polydeuces and Castor” (*Descr.* 8.2.4).²¹⁵

Cultural primitivism also evidences signs that the gods have a special relationship with peoples who are near the ends of the earth. For example, the Hyperboreans are said to be priests of the god Apollo who visits their island every nineteen years (Diodorus Siculus, 2.47.2, 6). Similarly, in his description of the Panchaeans, another primitivistic culture, Euhemerus tells of a mountain on which the god Uranus once enjoyed resting. He states,

Beyond the above-mentioned plain there is a lofty mountain which has been made sacred to the gods and is called the “Throne of Uranus” and also “Triphylian Olympus.” For the myth relates that in ancient times, when Uranus was king of the inhabited earth, he took pleasure in tarrying in that place and in surveying from its lofty top both the heavens and the stars therein. (Diodorus Siculus 5.44.5–6 [Oldfather, LCL]; cf. 6.1.6–10)

In like manner, Homer tells of the Phaeacians who have traits of soft-primitivism. Homer states that the Phaeacians were privy to a relationship with the gods that did not require concealment or trickery. And so when Odysseus arrives and they are trying to figure out if he is immortal or not, they state, “But if he is one of the immortals come down from heaven, then this is some new thing which the gods are planning; for always before this they have appeared before us in manifest form, when we sacrifice to them glorious hecatombs, and they feast among us, sitting where we sit” (*Od.* 7.199–203 [Murray, LCL]).²¹⁶ The resulting picture, then, is that some

²¹⁴ See also Babrius, *Aesopic Fables*, prologue 12–13; Plato, *Phileb.* 16C.

²¹⁵ Though Pausanias does not specifically mention the Golden Age, the passage from which this is quoted clearly represents chronological primitivism.

²¹⁶ See also *Od.* 7.77–112. Similarly, Homer also describes the Cyclopes as having a special relationship with the gods (*Od.* 9.106–115). Both the Phaeacians and Cyclopes are interesting in that both are described with primitivistic language, but both are also heavily critiqued. See Andrew Karp, “The Need for Boundaries: Homer’s Critique of the Phaeacian Utopia in the *Odyssey*,” *Utopian Studies* 6 (1995): 25–34; Annette Lucia Giesecke, “Homer’s Eutopolis: Epic Journeys and the Search for an Ideal Society,” *Utopian Studies* 14 (2003): 23–40.

primitive cultures are said to have a relationship with the gods in which the gods actually visit and interact with them.

In none of these descriptions is there any indication that one should expect to dwell with the gods as with other humans. Instead, the relationship is more fleeting. The gods occasionally visit or dine with humans, but in no case do they live with them regularly. This is true also of the Ethiopians, who more than any other group are said to entertain the gods. About the Ethiopians, Romm notes that the gods are said to “sojourn among them during ‘holiday leaves’ from Olympus and from the world at large,”²¹⁷ a fact attributed to their piety and moral virtue as well as the verdant nature of their land.²¹⁸ Though the Ethiopians come close to having a regular presence with the gods, the gods live on Olympus, not in Ethiopia.

Regarding afterlife expectations, of all the ancients, Plato gives the most hope for an afterlife in which humans will dwell with the gods. In describing the heavens, the sky-world in which people dwell after their spirits leave their bodies, he notes that “they have sacred groves and temples of the gods, in which the gods really dwell, and they have intercourse with the gods by speech and prophecies and visions, and they see the sun and moon and stars as they really are” (*Phaed.* 111B [Fowler, LCL]). And earlier in the *Phaedo* he writes, “Then if [the soul] is in such a condition [i.e. pure], it goes away into that which is like itself, into the invisible, divine, immortal, and wise, and when it arrives there it is happy, free from error and folly and fear and fierce loves and all the other human ills, and as the initiated say, lives in truth through all after time with the gods” (81A). Here, with Plato, is the best example one can find of an expectation in which human souls will dwell “with the gods” in the afterlife.

In conclusion, then, visitations from the gods are perfectly within the realm of possibility for most utopian expectations. Outside of the example from Plato, however, there is little expectation that the afterlife or any utopia will be spent with gods and humans dwelling together.

There is a tradition, however, that laments the loss of human-divine interaction through the decline of the ages, specifically the interaction

²¹⁷ Romm, *Edges of the Earth*, 50. See also, Joachim Latacz, “Zeus’ Reise zu den Äthiopen,” in *Gnomosyne: Menschliches Denken und Handeln in der frühgriechischen Literatur: Festschrift für Walter Marg zum 70 Geburtstag* (ed. G. Kurz, D. Müller, W. Nicolai; Munich: Beck 1981), 53–81.

²¹⁸ For example, the *Iliad* begins with Zeus dining with the blameless Ethiopians, from whom he and all the gods have to be called away in order to address the issue of the war that is brewing (1.424–425; cf. Diodorus, 3.2.3).

between humans and the goddess Astraea (Δίκη, Justice).²¹⁹ Beginning with Hesiod, the tradition is as follows:

There is a maiden, Justice [Δίκη], born of Zeus, celebrated and revered by the gods who dwell on Olympus, and whenever someone harms her by crookedly scorning her, she sits down at once beside her father Zeus, Cronus' son, and proclaims the unjust mind of human beings, so that he will take vengeance upon the people for the wickedness of their kings. . . .

Perses, lay these things up in your heart and give heed to Justice, and put violence entirely out of your mind. This is the law that Cronus' son has established for human beings: that fish and beasts and winged birds eat one another, since Justice is not among them; but to human beings he has given Justice, which is the best by far. For if someone who recognizes what is just is willing to speak it out publicly, then far-seeing Zeus gives him wealth. But whoever willfully swears a false oath, telling a lie in his testimony, he himself is incurably hurt at the same time as he harms Justice, and in after times his family is left more obscure; whereas the family of the man who keeps his oath is better in after times. (*Op.* 256–261, 274–285 [Most, LCL])

Here Astraea acts as a mediator between humans and the god Zeus. She has not necessarily fled humans as a result of the departure of the Golden Age, but she is tasked with keeping justice upon the earth. Hesiod maintains that if one acts justly in this life, he or she is rewarded; but if one acts unjustly, he or she is punished.

By the time of Aratus in the third century BCE, the story changes. Aratus tells of a progression that occurs through the gold, silver, and bronze ages. It is the steady departure of the goddess Astraea (or Δίκη, Justice) from the earth:

There is, however, another tale current among men, that once she actually live on earth, and came face to face with men, and did not ever spurn the tribes of ancient men and women, but sat in their midst although she was immortal. And they called her Justice: gathering together the elders, either in the market-place or on the broad highway, she urged them in prophetic tones to judgments for the good of the people. At that time they still had no knowledge of painful strife or quarrelsome conflict or noise of battle, but lived just as they were; the dangerous sea was far from their thoughts, and as yet no ships brought them livelihood from afar, but oxen and ploughs and Justice herself, queen of the people and giver of civilized life, provided all their countless needs. That was as long as the earth still nourished the

²¹⁹ The tradition of Astraea has considerable popularity in the ancient world. Besides Hesiod and Aratus, as mentioned below, see also Ps.-Eratosthenes, *Catasterismi* 1.244; Hyginus, *Poetica astronomica* 2.25; Ovid, *Metam.* 1.149–150; Ps.-Seneca, *Octavia* 423–425. Cf. Lovejoy and Boas, *Primitivism*, 34–38; Giamatti, *The Earthly Paradise*, 29–33.

Golden Age. But with the Silver she associated little, and now not at all willingly, as she longed for the ways of the earlier folk. But nevertheless she was still with the Silver Age too. She would emerge from the sounding mountains towards evening all alone, and not engage anyone in friendly conversation. But filling the broad hillsides with people, she would then speak menacingly, rebuking them for their wickedness, and say she would never more come face to face with them, even if they called her: 'What an inferior generation your golden fathers have left! And you are likely to beget a still more evil progeny. There will surely be wars, yes, and unnatural bloodshed among men, and suffering from their troubles will come upon them.' So saying she made for the mountains, and left the people all staring after her. But when these men also had died and there were born the Bronze Age men, more destructive than their predecessors, who were the first to forge the criminal sword for murder on the highways, and the first to taste the flesh of ploughing oxen, then Justice, conceiving a hatred for the generation of these men, flew up to the sky and took up her abode in that place, where she is still visible to men by night as the Maiden near conspicuous Bootes. (*Phaen.* 100–136 [Kidd])

Aratus' account is clearly different than Hesiod's. In Aratus, an immortal being, Astraea, did once dwell with humanity, though it should not go without notice that for Aratus this is clearly seen as an exception to the rule. Nevertheless, Aratus' narrative suggests that with the decline of society through the various ages, it became increasingly difficult for the goddess to dwell with humans. With the Bronze Age (Aratus' equivalent to Hesiod's Iron Age), Astraea must finally leave for good, at which time she departs the earth for her new home in the heavens.²²⁰

Rather than living side-by-side with the gods, the most common expectation is that one will live with the heroes of old, sometimes referred to as demigods.²²¹ This expectation is particularly tied to the tradition of the Islands of the Blessed and is found in Hesiod's description of the race of Heroes. He describes this race as "the godly race of men-heroes, who are called demigods" and states that they will dwell on the Islands of the Blessed (*Op.* 156–73). It should be noted that they are the *only* race that

²²⁰ The departure of the virgin, Astraea, is often associated with the loss of the Golden Age (see especially Ovid, *Metam.* 1.149–150). It is for this reason that the return of the "virgin" mentioned in Virgil's fourth *Eclogue* is quite likely a reference to the return of Astraea, which, along with the return of Saturn, would mark the arrival of the Golden Age (4.4–6).

²²¹ See Plato, *Apol.* 41A; Lucian, *Ver. hist.* 2.17–18.

he says will dwell on the islands. It is only later traditions, such as Pindar, that suggest otherwise.²²²

Nevertheless, there is a strong expectation that the afterlife will be spent with both the heroes of old, such as Achilles and Hector, and also Greece's most famous poets and philosophers. What one should not expect, at least from the majority of ancient Greco-Roman texts regarding the afterlife, is to spend time with Apollo, Zeus, or any of the other gods in the pantheon of Greco-Roman lore.

2.4. CONCLUSION

In chapter one, an essentialist definition for utopia was given: the place where the good life is lived. This chapter has filled out that definition by constructing a large-scale description of utopia according to Greco-Roman literature. The chapter proceeded in two stages; first, it categorized and classified three expressions of utopianism in Greco-Roman thought—political utopianism, primitivistic utopianism, and afterlife utopianism—and, second, it detailed fourteen common *topoi* present in Greco-Roman utopianism and various traditions attached to each *topos*.

The first part of this chapter was framed by the question, What expressions of utopia does one find in the Greco-Roman literature? This resulted in the construction of three categories as a way of organizing the primary source material and determining different ways the good life is conceived. The good life is sometimes achieved through properly structuring the polis; the good life is remembered and envisioned through stories of the Golden Age and remote cultures; and the good life is awaited and anticipated in visions of the blessed afterlife. The difference between political utopianism and the other two expressions is, at times, readily apparent, and thus Mumford's categories of "utopias of reconstruction" and "utopias of escape," though problematic, are not entirely without merit.²²³ Thus, while primitivistic and afterlife utopianism employ all fourteen *topoi* with regularity, political utopianism does not appeal to the *topoi* of wine, pleasant fragrances, music, light, and climate.

²²² See above. E.g. Pindar, *Ol.* 2.68–71. See Friedrich Solmsen, "Achilles on the Island of the Blessed: Pindar vs. Homer and Hesiod," *The American Journal of Philology* 103 (1982): 19–24.

²²³ Mumford, *The Story of Utopias*, 15.

The second half of this chapter delineates specific features of the good life through the designation of fourteen *topoi*. The fourteen *topoi*, some of which blend into one another, serve as a means of housing detailed discussions about traditions concerning aspects of a utopian world.

The evidence reviewed in the second half of the chapter resulted in the following description of the Greco-Roman utopia. Despite the necessarily urban nature of political utopianism, most ancients expressed utopia in a rural setting set apart from the trappings of urban life and embraced the tranquility of the rural or pastoral life. There is a wide range of attitudes toward wealth, but outside of a few positive references to the accumulation of wealth, it is often understood to be a corrupting force and, therefore, either shunned altogether or kept in a common purse. Temples to the gods are typically found in utopia; rivers are a means of achieving tranquility and sometimes healing; and both food and wine are typically found in abundance often without the work that accompanies their production. The locale of utopia is often described as a fragrant place with beautiful music filling the air, appropriate amounts of light (not too much but not too little), and a climate that is both enjoyable for humans and proper for easily growing crops. Utopia is typically a peaceful place, sheltered from the harsh realities of war, and often a place of little or no toil such that its inhabitants are free from anxiety produced by the stresses of daily labor and concerns over whether food will be on the table. Finally, the Greco-Roman utopia is not a place where gods and humans live together but is a place where one might encounter the gods on occasion and, in the afterlife, will live with the human heroes of Greco-Roman lore.

CHAPTER THREE

JEWISH UTOPIA

3.1. INTRODUCTION

As noted in the introductory chapter, the *idea* of utopianism is common to many cultures even if the term *utopia/utopian* is not used. For this reason, to speak of ancient Jewish utopianism is no more foreign or alien to the Jewish culture than it was to speak of the utopianism of the ancient Greco-Roman culture. As with the previous chapter, *utopia* as used throughout this chapter is not meant to express a literary genre but a set of expectations about the good life. The precedent for using the term *utopia* to speak about aspects of ancient Jewish thought is strong, and to date a substantial number of biblical scholars use the term in conjunction with ancient Judaism, a trend that is only increasing.¹ This work stands within this stream of scholarship.

¹ The scholar who has published most at the crossroads of utopia and Judaism is Mary Ann Beavis. See eadem, *Jesus & Utopia: Looking for the Kingdom of God in the Roman World* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2006); eadem, "The Kingdom of God, 'Utopia' and Theocracy," *Journal for the Study of the Historical Jesus* 2 (2004): 91–106; eadem, "Philo's Therapeutai: Philosopher's Dream or Utopian Construction?," *JSP* 14 (2004): 30–42. Other authors and works include, Yairah Amit, "Biblical Utopianism: A Mapmakers Guide to Eden," *USQR* 44 (1990): 11–17; Ehud Ben Zvi, ed., *Utopia and Dystopia in Prophetic Literature* (Publications of the Finnish Exegetical Society 92; Helsinki: Finnish Exegetical Society; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2006); Michael Chyutin, *Architecture and Utopia in the Temple Era* (Library of Second Temple Studies 58; London: T&T Clark, 2006); John J. Collins, "Models of Utopia in the Biblical Tradition," in *"A Wise and Discerning Mind": Essays in Honor of Burke O. Long* (BJS 325; ed. S. M. Olyan and R. C. Culley; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2000), 51–67; Ferguson, *Utopias of the Ancient World* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1975); Joyce Oramel Hertzler, *The History of Utopian Thought* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1923); Ehud Luz, "Utopia and Return: On the Structure of Utopian Thinking and Its Relation to Jewish-Christian Tradition," *JR* 73 (1993): 357–77; Doron Mendels, "Hellenistic Utopia and the Essenes," *HTR* 72 (1979): 207–22; Jacob Neusner, "Qumran and Jerusalem: Two Jewish Roads to Utopia," *JBR* 27 (1959): 284–90; idem, *Rabbinic Utopia* (Studies in Judaism; Lanham, Md.: University Press of America, 2007); Louis Simon, "L'utopie de la résurrection dans le Nouveau Testament," *FoiVie* 74 (1975): 23–36; Peter-Ben Smit, *Fellowship and Food in the Kingdom: Eschatological Meals and Scenes of Utopian Abundance in the New Testament* (WUNT 2, 234; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008); Lucio Troiani, "L'Utopia in alcuni testi della letteratura ebraica di età greca," in *Utopia e utopie nel pensiero storico antico. Centro Ricerche e Documentazione sull'Antichità Classica* (ed. C. Carsana and M. T. Schettino; Monografie 30; Roma: "L'Erma" di Bretschneider,

As with the previous chapter, this chapter proceeds in two parts. In the first half, it constructs and describes a categorical model for conceiving of Jewish utopian expression. Here important texts and passages used in the construction of a Jewish utopia are highlighted. The dating of the material used in this chapter extends from the writing of the Hebrew Scripture² through early Judaism up to about 200 CE. The second half of the chapter then maps out the topography of utopia as found in these texts and passages. The variety within Jewish traditions regarding specific utopian *topoi* are explicated and entertained. This half of the chapter, therefore, looks to isolate specific aspects of Jewish utopian expectations in order to paint a detailed picture of Jewish utopianism.

3.2. THE CATEGORIES OF UTOPIAN EXPRESSION

John Collins and Mary Ann Beavis have made attempts to classify the various modes of Jewish utopian expression.³ Collins has suggested four categories of utopian expression found in biblical literature.

The first, which envisions a transformed land of Israel, may be termed agricultural. The second, which focuses on an ideal Jerusalem, has an urban character. The third is the model of an ideal community, such as we find in the Dead Sea Scrolls and in the writings of Philo. The fourth, which appears at the beginning of Genesis and again in apocalyptic visions at the end of the biblical period, is properly utopian in the sense that the place it imagines is out of this world.⁴

The overall thrust of Collins' article is concerned with answering the question, *where* is utopia located? Using the categories of Jonathan Smith ("locative" and "utopian"), Collins takes pains to emphasize the "locative," or this-worldly, nature of the majority of biblical utopianism (over against

2008), 49–56; Binyamin Uffenheimer, "Utopia and Reality in Biblical Thought," *Immanuel* 9 (1979): 5–15; Robert Webber, "The Apocalypse as *Utopia*: Ancient and Modern Subjectivity," in *Society of Biblical Literature 1993 Seminar Papers* (SBLSP 32; ed. E. H. Lovering; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1993), 104–18.

² The phrase "Hebrew Scripture" is used throughout this chapter as a reference to the texts found in what today is called the Hebrew Bible or the Old Testament. Prior to the second century CE, no specific body of literature or canonical list of texts has been shown to be in circulation, and thus the term is anachronistic. Nevertheless, the term is used for the sake of convenience.

³ Collins, "Models of Utopia"; Beavis, *Jesus and Utopia*, 29–31.

⁴ Collins, "Models of Utopia," 52.

a utopianism as defined as “no place”).⁵ That is to say, the majority of Jewish utopian desires center around a specific plot of land rather than a desire for an other-worldly existence.⁶ Collins’ interest in the location of utopia functions as the governor of his categories resulting in three of the four categories being directly connected to the question of location (the land of Israel, ideal Jerusalem, and the heavenly paradise) with only the category of “ideal community” as an exception (though even that could be conceived of as locative).

Mary Ann Beavis claims to blend Collins’ categories with Doyne Dawson’s categories for Greco-Roman utopias.⁷ She offers three categories, the second of which has two sub-categories: 1. “Mythological works” such as the Edenic tradition; 2. Traditions regarding the land or the nation of Israel, whether “locative-temporal utopias” on the one hand (e.g. idealized descriptions of the land) or “legal-covenantal utopias” on the other hand (e.g. the Law of Moses as template for ideal theocracy); 3. “Dynamic-theocratic traditions” in which God is understood mythically as the king of the universe who acts on behalf of the people of his kingdom, a category that includes “traditions of the tribal confederacy,” royal Psalms, and prophecies of the future restoration of Israel.⁸ Beavis’ subject matter—the kingdom of God as utopia—has clearly guided the construction of her categories as evidenced by the inclusion of “Dynamic-theocratic traditions” as its own category of utopianism, a category that works well as a means of collecting data regarding kings and kingdom language. This category is of lesser importance to the present study. Nevertheless, Beavis’s categories are close to those used in this study with special reference to her second category.

Rather than adopt the categories of Collins or Beavis *in toto*, this chapter draws from them in order to collate and categorize the variety within Jewish utopian expectations and ultimately construct new categories that will best serve the data collected here. Due to the enormity of the data

⁵ Cf. Smith, *Map is Not Territory* (SJLA 23; Leiden: Brill, 1978), 101.

⁶ As will be addressed below under “Eschatological Utopianism: Eschatology in Early Judaism,” it appears Collins has overstated the case for a “locative” utopia by understating those Jewish texts in which the eschaton is not somehow attached to the land of Israel or Jerusalem. There is undoubtedly a strong tradition of attachment to the land, but there is also a strong tradition in which the land is not the centerpiece of utopian desire.

⁷ Beavis, *Jesus and Utopia*, 30. See the previous chapter for Dawson’s categories (cf. *Cities of the Gods: Communist Utopias in Greek Thought* [New York: Oxford University Press, 1992], 7).

⁸ Beavis, *Jesus and Utopia*, 30–31.

that must be placed into the categories, this study intentionally takes a minimalist approach. The three categories used here are primarily chronological in nature. It should be noted that the categories have overlapping elements, an unavoidable fact of speaking about utopianism.

First, *Edenic utopianism* or *utopias of Eden* will refer primarily to the Genesis narrative of Eden and the traditions that stem from it. Second, *nationalistic utopias* encapsulate traditions about the people and place of Israel in the “world as we know it,” by which is simply meant the age that lies between humanity’s exodus from Eden and entrance into the eschaton. The “world as we know it” does not exclude mythological language or imagery, and includes, for example, descriptions of the “land flowing with milk and honey,” nostalgic descriptions of the Davidic kingdom, and utopian communities such as the Essenes or the Therapeutai. Here this study’s indebtedness to Beavis is most evident in that it subdivides this category into legal-covenantal utopias (primarily concerned with the *people* Israel) and locative-temporal utopias (primarily concerned with the *land* of Israel). Third, *eschatological utopianism* includes utopian descriptions of a future age that is markedly different from this present age.

3.2.1. *Edenic Utopianism*

Edenic utopianism is unique for our purposes in that there is a very specific and incontrovertible source from which the tradition springs: Genesis 2–3.⁹ Any later Jewish tradition that employs the Eden motif is, at the very least, relying on this source. The Eden narrative is a form of chronological primitivistic as found in the Greco-Roman literature and, in this way, is to Judaism what Hesiod’s myth of the Golden Age is to Hellenistic authors. It describes an age, however brief, in which humanity lived in an ideal state, an age which no longer exists and, for some, served as a *Gegenwelt*

⁹ It should be stated, though, that despite the fact that Genesis 2–3 is clearly the source of later Edenic traditions, the formation of Genesis 2–3 is a matter of great debate. As Stordalen notes, the “traditional view” of Genesis 2–3 is that it is a composite text (*Echoes of Eden: Genesis 2–3 and Symbolism of the Eden Garden in Biblical Hebrew Literature* [CBET 25; Leuven: Peeters, 2000], 190–92; cf. Claus Westermann, *Genesis 1–11: A Commentary* [tr. J. J. Scullion; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1974]; Howard N. Wallace, *The Eden Narrative* [HSM 32; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1985]; Wyatt, “Interpreting the Creation and Fall Story,” *ZAW* 93 [1981]: 10–21). The development of the text, therefore, must be taken into consideration when looking at traditions that draw on this text (e.g., see below under the *topos* “Food” [The Food of Eden and the Two Trees]).

(contrast world) for this present age, and for others, served as a prototype for the life to come.¹⁰

The phrase “garden of Eden” is a translation of the Hebrew *gan eden* (גן עדן) whose etymology has occupied scholars for some time. Beavis notes: “Several derivations have been argued for the Hebrew ‘eden: ‘steppe or plain’ from Sumerian; ‘pleasure, luxury’ from the Hebrew root ‘dn; or the Aramaic ‘dn, ‘enrich, give abundance.’”¹¹ Equally as important for later traditions is the Greek translation *paradeisos* (παράδεισος), a lush garden filled with trees, water (whether rivers or lakes), and abundant vegetation.¹² Second Temple Judaism frequently uses the word *paradise* as a substitute for *Eden*, typically an Edenic afterlife.¹³ This chapter and the next also will reserve the word *paradise* for descriptions that are clearly Edenic in nature.

¹⁰ See Stordalen, *Echoes of Eden*, 297; Stolz, “Paradiese und Gegenwelten,” *Zeitschrift für Religionswissenschaft* 1 (1993): 5–24. Noort comes to a similar conclusion about the use of paradise in Ezekiel 28 and 31 stating, “Paradise is the world of contrast to the real world people live in” (“Gan-Eden in the Context of the Mythology of the Hebrew Bible,” in *Paradise Interpreted: Representations of Biblical Paradise in Judaism and Christianity* (ed. G. Luttikhuisen; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 36.

¹¹ Beavis, *Jesus and Utopia*, 32. Cf. Millard, “Etymology of Eden,” *VT* 34 (1984): 103–105; Noort, “Gan-Eden in the Context of the Mythology of the Hebrew Bible,” 21–22.

¹² For the etymology and evolution of the term *paradeisos* see Jan N. Bremmer, “Paradise: From Persia, via Greece, into the *Septuagint*,” in *Paradise Interpreted: Representations of Biblical Paradise in Judaism and Christianity* (ed. G. Luttikhuisen; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 1–20; idem, *The Rise and Fall of the Afterlife* (London: Routledge, 2002), 109–19; Christopher Tuplin, *Achaemenid Studies* (Historia Einzelschriften 99; Stuttgart: Steiner, 1996), 80–131. During the Achaemenid Empire the *paradeisos* was a large, lush piece of land typically owned by royalty and social elites and used as a place for hunting animals. Bremmer rightly argues that this is not the usage of the LXX nor of later Jewish traditions. Later usage of *paradeisos* in the post-Achaemenid period referred to parks without wild animals or hunting, parks that were more like a modest public garden than a large piece of property owned by elites and royalty. In the Roman era, *paradeisoi* were increasingly artificial, containing beds of flowers and even sometimes inhabited by swans, parrots, and peacock (Bremmer, *The Rise and Fall of the Afterlife*, 114–18; cf. Longus 4.2–4; Achilles Tatius 1.15).

¹³ That Eden or paradise is often used as a designation for an eschatological locale poses a challenge to this study’s categories of utopias in that Edenic utopias and eschatological utopias have a significant amount of crossover material. This is evidenced by the repetition of certain passages in Appendix B. To further complicate the issue, these two expressions of utopianism also share space with nationalistic utopias especially with regard to temple imagery and traditions. The conflation of Eden, the temple, and the eschaton is to be expected and is indeed found with relative ease. *Second Baruch* 4.3–6 is an excellent example in which all three elements are present and the author moves seamlessly among them. In light of this, rather than expect the three categories to serve as hard and fast lines distinguishing one utopia from another, it is best to conceive of them on a Venn diagram in which a considerable amount of overlap is built in to the system.

In Jewish literature, Eden makes an appearance in one of three forms: as a retrospective account reporting the narrative as told in Genesis 2–3 (e.g. *Jubilees* 3.8–35), as a forward-looking account of what the world will be like in the eschaton, and as a point of comparison for descriptions of the temple.¹⁴ The survey of Edenic expression that follows will sketch the larger landscape of biblical and extra-biblical works in which the place or the characters of Eden make an appearance.

One is struck by how few references are made to Eden or aspects of the Eden narrative in the Hebrew Scripture. For this reason, Eibert Tigchelaar states quite plainly, “The narrative of Adam and Eve in the Garden of Eden receives no attention in the Hebrew Bible outside of Gen 2–3.”¹⁵ He argues that references and allusions to the place Eden are a scarcity in the Hebrew Scripture, and though “phenomenological approaches or metaphorical readings may suspect allusions to Eden or Paradise in many other passages,” these need not be tied *necessarily* to Genesis 2–3.¹⁶ Even Stordalen, the most ardent advocate for the centrality of Eden’s role in the Hebrew Scripture, finds only six “non-ambiguous” passages referring

¹⁴ Two articles are particularly helpful in determining the usage of the Eden material in Second Temple Judaism. Benedikt Otzen, speaking about the two trees present in the garden, remarks that typically the tree of knowledge is “always seen in retrospect” while the tree of life is primarily “seen in a future perspective” (“The Paradise Trees in Jewish Apocalyptic,” in *Apocryphon Severini: Presented to Søren Giversen* [ed. P. Bilde, H. K. Nielsen, J. Podemann Sørensen; Aarhus, Denmark: Aarhus University Press, 1993], 141). Peter Lanfer writes about how Second Temple authors transformed the Eden narrative in two ways—Eden as ideal or original temple, and Eden as future paradise (“Allusion to and Expansion of the Tree of Life and Garden of Eden in Biblical and Pseudepigraphal Literature” in *Early Christian Literature and Intertextuality* [vol. 1; ed. C. Evans and H. D. Zacharias; London: T&T Clark, 2009], 96–108, esp. 96–97). Both Otzen and Lanfer share an interest in the future Eden, by far the most common expression of Eden in Second Temple Judaism as will be evident from the survey that follows, and each suggests a unique usage of Eden (as retrospect and as ideal temple). All three uses are viable options.

¹⁵ Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, “Eden and Paradise: The Garden Motif in Some Early Jewish Texts (1 Enoch and other Texts Found at Qumran)” in *Paradise Interpreted: Representations of Biblical Paradise in Judaism and Christianity* (ed. G. Luttikhuisen; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 37. He goes on to qualify this statement, mentioning Ezekiel 28 and 31 as examples of passages in which the author alludes to Genesis 2–3 as a comparison for that which he is trying to describe, Tyre and Assyria (interestingly not Israel). Tigchelaar also grants that other passages may contain paradisaic imagery (e.g. Ezekiel 47 and Zechariah 14).

Similarly, Brueggemann writes: “It has been assumed that this is a decisive text for the Bible and that it states the premise for all that follows. In fact, this is an exceedingly marginal text. No clear subsequent reference to it is made in the Old Testament, though there are perhaps links in Ezek. 28” (*Genesis* [Interpretation; Atlanta: John Knox, 1982], 41). This conclusion is consistent with this study’s findings (contra Stordalen who quotes Brueggemann disapprovingly [*Echoes of Eden*, 21]).

¹⁶ Tigchelaar, “Eden and Paradise,” 37.

to Eden (Gen 13:10; Isa 51:3; Joel 2:3; Ezek 28:12b–15; 31:2–9; 36:35).¹⁷ And of these six passages, only Ezekiel 28 shows any concern for the larger narrative of the Eden story, however limited; the other five simply use Eden as a metaphor for a luscious garden with no interest in the characters of Eden or the events that took place there.

The lack of interest in Eden in the Hebrew Scripture is even more striking when one looks for the characters of Eden outside Genesis. Neither Adam nor Eve makes a single appearance in the Hebrew Scripture (save for the genealogy in 1 Chr 1:1), the tree of knowledge is also nowhere to be found, and though the tree of life is referenced four times in the book of Proverbs, none of the references are connected to the larger Eden narrative. Only the serpent appears in two passages that could be a reference to the curse in Eden—“its food shall be dust” (Isa 65:25; cf. Mic 7:17)—but even these references do not emphasize a connection to the larger Eden narrative in any substantial way. No matter how one parses the numbers, the references to the Eden narrative are strikingly minimal in the Hebrew Scripture. The result, therefore, is that on the most generous counting, there is an evident dearth of interest in the characters, place, and especially the narrative of Eden.

In contrast to the Hebrew Scripture, Eden is quite popular throughout the pseudepigraphical literature, though descriptive details about the topography of Eden are still lacking, and interest in Eden is mostly directed at the eschatological Eden. Nevertheless, the cast of Edenic characters (Adam, Eve, the two trees, the serpent, and the cherubim) makes appearances in early Jewish literature in a way not found in the Hebrew Scripture. Traditions about these characters even take on a life of their own, a life that presses beyond the Genesis narrative.¹⁸

¹⁷ Stordalen, “Heaven on Earth—Or Not? Jerusalem as Eden in Biblical Literature” in *Beyond Eden: The Biblical Story of Paradise (Genesis 2–3) and Its Reception History* (ed. K. Schmid and C. Riedweg; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008), 30. Despite the few unambiguous passages, Stordalen is optimistic about how many “echoes of Eden” one hears throughout the Hebrew Scripture (*Echoes of Eden*, 305–454). For Stordalen, “[*gan eden*] hovers behind at least 30 biblical passages, possibly many more” (“Heaven on Earth,” 30).

¹⁸ Adam, for example, sometimes serves as a prototype of the final, eschatological state of humanity (“the glory of Adam”) and other times as the prototypical sinner (Paul and 4 Ezra are two notable examples; cf. Stone, *Ancient Judaism: New Visions and Views* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2011], 32, 52–58). Also, much is made of the two trees of Eden, the tree of life and the tree of knowledge. Each serves a specific end (the tree of life is typically forward looking while the tree of knowledge is typically backward looking), and one tree is often mentioned where the other is not (See below under the *topos* “Food”).

Eden makes a significant appearance in five apocalyptic works: *The Book of Watchers* (1 *En.* 32.1–6), *The Book of Similitudes* (1 *En.* 60.8, 23; 61.1–13; 70.3–4), 4 *Ezra* (4.8; 7.36, 123), 2 *Baruch* (4.3–6; 51.11), and 2 *Enoch* (8.1–9.1; 31.1–8; 42.3–14). Each of these will be treated in the approximate order of their writing.

First Enoch 32, contained within the *Book of Watchers*¹⁹—one of five “books” within 1 *Enoch*—describes an Eden in which the tree of knowledge is present and noted as the reason for the fall of Adam and Eve; this Eden presently stands empty.²⁰ Furthermore, the Eden of 1 *Enoch* 32 does not serve an eschatological function but will always remain empty since Jerusalem, not Eden, is the eschatological dwelling place for the righteous (24.5). However, unlike the Eden of the *Watchers*, the Eden of the *Similitudes*²¹ (1 *En.* 60, 61, and 70) is presently filled with the righteous and is perceived as the eschatological place where all the righteous will eventually dwell.

*Fourth Ezra*²² and 2 *Baruch*²³ primarily speak of paradise in eschatological terms. Paradise functions as the blessed home of the righteous in the world to come. *Second Baruch* 4 does make mention of Adam and his

¹⁹ The challenge to dating the *Book of Watchers* lies in its composite nature. Nickelsburg, for example, finds at least five layers of redaction in these thirty-six chapters (George W. E. Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1: A Commentary on the Book of 1 Enoch, Chapters 1–36; 81–108* [Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2001]), 129–332. Nevertheless, the earliest portions of the *Book of Watchers* (along with the *Astronomical Book* [1 *Enoch* 72–82]) likely date back to the third century BCE and represent some of the oldest extant literature from the period of early Judaism (John J. Collins, *The Apocalyptic Imagination: An Introduction to Jewish Apocalyptic Literature* [2d ed.; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998], 44; Michael E. Stone, “The Book of Enoch and Judaism in the Third Century B.C.E.,” *CBQ* 40 [1978]: 484).

²⁰ Scholars have traditionally posited that another heavenly Eden is described in chs. 24–25, but this has been called into question in recent years. See below under the *topos* “Food”.

²¹ Dating the *Similitudes* is notoriously difficult. Though some scholars have opted for a later date (e.g., Milik dates the book to the third century CE [J. T. Milik, *The Books of Enoch: Aramaic Fragments of Qumran Cave 4* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1976), 96]), the majority of scholarship argues for a much earlier date in the first century CE (see Paolo Sacchi, “The 2005 Camaldoli Seminar on the Parables of Enoch: Summary and Prospects for Future Research,” in *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man: Revisiting the Book of Parables* [ed. G. Bocaccini; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007], 506–11; George W. E. Nickelsburg and James C. VanderKam, *1 Enoch 2: A Commentary on the Book of 1 Enoch, Chapters 37–82* [Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2012], 58–63).

²² Most scholars date 4 *Ezra* to about 100 CE (B. M. Metzger, “The Fourth Book of Ezra” in *OTP* 1:520).

²³ *Second Baruch* is typically dated sometime after the fall of the temple in 70 CE, perhaps during the time of Bar Kokhba around 130 CE (A. F. J. Klijn, “2 [Syriac Apocalypse of] Baruch,” in *OTP* 1:616–17). Klijn (along with the majority of scholars) argues that it was likely written after 4 *Ezra* due to an “advanced stage of theological development” (*OTP* 1:617).

removal from paradise, noting that God showed the temple to Adam (as well as Abraham and Moses), but the temple was taken away when Eden was taken away and sits preserved in the heavenly paradise which awaits the eschaton.

Similarly, 2 *Enoch* uses Eden as both the primeval Eden and a heavenly, eschatological Eden, “open as far as the 3rd heaven” (42.3).²⁴ The primeval Eden is mentioned in chapter 31 and contains a description of the fall of Adam and Eve in which the devil is said to be the tempter, implicitly referring to the serpent; strangely, though, the term “serpent” is never used. Chapters 8 and 42, however, describe the heavenly Eden in utopian terms with an abundance of food, pleasant fragrances wafting through the air, and the presence of God.

Outside of the apocalyptic tradition, the book of *Jubilees*, dated around 161–140 BCE, reworks the Eden narrative in such a way that it remains similar to the biblical story but with a few modifications.²⁵ As a book of rewritten Scripture one might expect that the Eden narrative would be expanded and elaborated upon, yet vivid details about the garden itself are severely lacking. The author states that Adam and Eve spent seven years in the garden of Eden tilling and guarding it, tasks that the angels had taught them (*Jub.* 3.15–16; cf. 3.35). Of the events that took place in their seven years in the garden, however, the author does not wish to elaborate. Two notable aspects of the Genesis narrative that the author leaves out altogether are the tree of life and the rivers that course through Eden. As argued below (under the *topos* “Food”), the absence of the tree of life is significant in that it may suggest *Jubilees* was only aware of one tree, the tree of knowledge.²⁶

On the other hand, the author of *Jubilees* elaborates on the Genesis narrative providing a few details not mentioned, or at least not made explicit, in the Genesis account. First, according to *Jubilees*, many if not all of the animals in the garden were capable of speaking, a trait they lose after

²⁴ Note that all citations of works appearing in Charlesworth's *OTP* are from the translations therein with one exception. The translation of 1 *Enoch* by Nickelsburg and VanderKam is used throughout (1 *Enoch: A New Translation* [Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2004]). The reason for this translation over the one in the *OTP* is that Isaac's translation of 1 *Enoch* in the *OTP* relies entirely on the Ethiopic text with little regard for extant Aramaic and Greek texts that predate the Ethiopic. For Jewish works not included in the *OTP*, translations are noted as they are used.

²⁵ The dating of *Jubilees* is without much conflict. See O. S. Wintermute, “Jubilees (Second Century BC),” in *OTP* 2:43–44.

²⁶ Cf. Tigchelaar, “Eden and Paradise,” 47.

the fall (3.28; cf. Philo, *QG* 1.32; Josephus, *Ant.* 1.4). That *all* of the animals speak, not just the serpent, suggests that the author of *Jubilees* (as well as Philo and Josephus) did not connect the serpent to a Satan figure but viewed it as one among many sentient beings in the garden. Second, *Jub.* 4.23 states that Enoch was led to the garden of Eden where he alone remains to this day. In *Jubilees*, then, Eden is described as a terrestrial paradise, a place located in the east and threatened by, but spared from, the Flood. As with the Genesis narrative (and the majority of traditions about Eden), the topographical details of the place are left to the imagination of the reader. Finally, the author of *Jubilees* makes an important theological move equating Eden with the temple.²⁷ He emphasizes the holiness of the garden at a few points in his work (*Jub.* 2.7; 3.12) equating it with both the holy of holies and Mount Sinai (8.19; cf. 3.27).²⁸

Philo treats the Eden narrative in a number of works, most notably in *Questions and Answers on Genesis I* (*QG* 1.1–57), *Allegorical Interpretation* (*Leg. I, II, III*), *On the Creation* (*Opif.* 145–172), *On Planting* (*Plant.* 32–40).²⁹

²⁷ See Lanfer, “Allusion to and Expansion of the Tree of Life,” 98–99; Jacques van Ruiten, “Eden and the Temple: The Rewriting of Genesis 2:4–3:24 in *The Book of Jubilees*,” in *Paradise Interpreted: Representations of Biblical Paradise in Judaism and Christianity* (ed. Gerard Luttikhuisen; Leiden: Brill, 1999), esp. 75–79; idem, “Visions of the Temple in the book of *Jubilees*,” in *Gemeinde ohne Tempel—Community without Temple: Zur Substituierung und Transformation des Jerusalemer Tempels und seines Kults im Alten Testament, antiken Judentum und frühen Christentum* (WUNT 118; ed. B. Ego, A. Lange and P. Pilhofer; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1999), 215–27; Brooke, “Miqdash Adam, Eden, and the Qumran Community,” in *Gemeinde ohne Tempel—Community without Temple: Zur Substituierung und Transformation des Jerusalemer Tempels und seines Kults im Alten Testament, antiken Judentum und frühen Christentum* (WUNT 118; Edited by B. Ego, A. Lange, and P. Pilhofer; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1999), 285–301.

²⁸ Some scholars have tried to argue that the equation of the temple and Eden is found in a number of passages from the Hebrew Scripture (e.g. Zech 14:8; Joel 3:18; Ps 46:4), however, such arguments are not convincing with the exception of Ezekiel 47 (Levenson, *The Theology of the Program of Restoration of Ezekiel 40–48* [HSM 10; Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1976], 34; Lanfer, “Allusion to and Expansion of the Tree of Life,” 99–100). Ezekiel is the only book in the Hebrew Scripture that employs the motif of the garden of Eden in a way consonant with Genesis 2–3 evidencing that the author is aware of and interested in Eden (cf. Ezek 28:12–15). It is possible, therefore, that based on the author’s expressed knowledge of Eden, Ezekiel 47 has Edenic resonances. By describing the urban setting of Jerusalem with rural characteristics, morphing it into a place flowing with a great river with trees on its banks, the author brings together traditions about Eden and the Temple in a unique way. Other passages from the Hebrew Scripture, however, may have rural characteristics but contain few if any signals to the reader that one should be interpreting such characteristics as echoes of Eden.

²⁹ Philo lived and wrote in Alexandria c. 20 BCE to c. 50 CE (see G. E. Sterling, “Philo,” in *Dictionary of New Testament Background* [ed. C. Evans and S. Porter; Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity Press, 2000], 789).

On the whole, Philo prefers to read the Eden narrative through an allegorical lens, as is most clearly evident in his treatise *Allegorical Interpretation*, which primarily deals with Genesis 2–3 and spends little space on any manner of literal interpretation.³⁰ On occasions where Philo does read Genesis 2–3 literally, he does so in order to point out the futility of such a reading of arguing that the contradictions within the text call for an interpreter to approach the text allegorically.³¹ For example, in *Questions and Answers* he gives a definition of paradise beginning with a literal definition but quickly moves to its allegorical significance, i.e. wisdom (*QG* 1.6).³² In another passage, Philo raises the issue of the physical location of the four rivers of Eden and the geographical problems associated with them (i.e., they do not properly correspond to any extant rivers). He does so in order to show the futility of a literal reading so that he can then move to an allegorical reading of the rivers, stating: “The subject of the passage is not the river, but amendment of character” (*Leg.* 1.85 [Colson and Whitaker, LCL]; cf. *QG* 1.12–13). By allegorizing the Eden narrative, Philo speaks on a different plane of meaning, one that is less concerned with the topography of utopia and more concerned with the virtues of humanity. The result is that despite his interest in and deep reflection on Eden, much of Philo’s reflection concerns matters of the virtuous life rather than a description of utopia and is therefore of peripheral interest to this study.

Despite his penchant for allegorizing, Philo does occasionally address questions other Jewish authors of his day are interested in, questions that interest us here. It is in Philo’s *Questions and Answers on Genesis* that one will find the allegorical interspersed with literal readings of the Eden narrative. For example, he notes that there is an unmistakable problem with locating paradise between the Tigris and the Euphrates in the mountains

³⁰ It is worth noting that Philo did not believe himself to be interpreting against the grain of the author’s intention but often states that the biblical authors intentionally wrote allegorically, and thus Philo claims to be working within the authorial intent. Cf. *Opif.* 154; *Leg.* 1.3; Niehoff, “Philo’s Scholarly Inquiries into the Story of Paradise,” in *Paradise in Antiquity: Jewish and Christian Views* (ed. M. Bockmuehl and G. Stroumsa; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), 41–42.

³¹ See especially Niehoff, “Philo’s Scholarly Inquiries into Paradise,” 37–42. For example, he writes that Philo “admits that Scripture, read literally, deviates from geographical truth, but insists that the story really is about the improvement of character. The very fact that there are problems on the literal level is taken as an indication that an allegorical reading is called for” (41). Cf. *Opif.* 157; *Plant.* 32–36.

³² For the literal definition, he writes: “Of Paradise, so far as the literal definition is concerned, there is no need to give an explicit interpretation. For it is a dense place full of all kinds of trees” (*QG* 1.6 [Marcus, LCL]).

of Armenia, namely “in that place there is no paradise” (*QG* 1.12 [Marcus, LCL]). As a solution to this conundrum, and before appealing to allegory, he suggests that perhaps “Paradise is in some distant place far from our inhabited world” (1.12). By locating paradise in a far distant land, he gives credence to a literal Eden located somewhere in the cosmos. Furthermore, he treats the text’s literal meaning by commenting on the nature of Adam’s work in the garden (1.14), the speech and character of animals in the garden (1.18, 32), and the reason for Adam and Eve’s nakedness (1.30).

Similar to *Jubilees*, Josephus recounts the Eden narrative as rewritten Scripture in his *Antiquities of the Jews* (1.37–51), written at the end of the first century CE. This is the only mention of Eden or paradise in the entire Josephus corpus. Josephus’ account contains all of the characters represented in the Genesis narrative—Adam, Eve, God, the serpent, and the two trees—with only the cherubim not represented. There are two elements Josephus adds to the Eden narrative that is not explicit within the Genesis account. First, with *Jubilees* and Philo, Josephus posits that all living creatures shared a language (*Ant.* 1.41).³³ Thus not only the serpent spoke but so did other animals in the garden. Second, Josephus adds a brief speech from the lips of God in which God laments that Adam and Eve will not experience the world as he intended it:

God said, “Nay, I had decreed for you to live a life of bliss, unmolested by all ill, with no care to fret your souls; all things that contribute to enjoyment and pleasure were, through my providence, to spring up or you spontaneously, without toil or distress of yours; blessed with these gifts, old age would not soon have overtaken you and your life would have been long. (*Ant.* 1.46–47 [Thackeray, LCL])

This short description of Eden prior to the fall is one of only a few elaborations on Edenic life in the extant Jewish literature, though it should be mentioned that it carries with it a few hallmarks of the Greco-Roman traditions, most notably that Edenic life did not require labor and food grew “spontaneously” (αὐτομάτως), themes common in the Greco-Roman tradition but not the Jewish tradition (see below under *topos* “Work”).

Eden makes a few unique appearances in Pseudo-Philo’s *Biblical Antiquities* (*L.A.B.* 11.15; 19.10–12; 25.11–26.15; 32.8).³⁴ The discussion of Eden

³³ He writes: “At that epoch all the creatures spoke a common tongue” (Thackeray, LCL).

³⁴ For two helpful articles on Eden in *L.A.B.* see Bauckham, “Paradise in the *Biblical Antiquities* of Pseudo-Philo,” in *Paradise in Antiquity* (eds. M. Bockmuehl and G. Stroumsa; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), 43–56; C. T. R. Hayward, “The Figure of

oscillates between a backward-looking glance at paradise in the time of Adam and Eve and a forward-looking picture of paradise as a place where the righteous will dwell after the resurrection. Pseudo-Philo's understanding of the afterlife is entirely in keeping with an Edenic *Urzeit*. Though Pseudo-Philo is not explicit about the location and nature of paradise, Bauckham is right to argue that, if the author is consistent in his thinking throughout the work, then paradise is most likely located in a heavenly realm where it sits having been preserved from the time of Adam and Eve and awaits the presence of all the righteous in the afterlife.³⁵ As for the features of Eden, Pseudo-Philo echoes a tradition in which twelve stones from the land of Havilah (i.e. the land mentioned in Gen 2:11–12 around which the Pishon flows, a land with gold, bdellium, and onyx stone) are given to Kenaz (Israel's leader after Joshua) who puts them into the ark of the covenant where they are kept until "the sins of [Israel] have reached full measure" (26.13), i.e. the Babylonian captivity, at which time the stones will be placed in paradise awaiting the resurrection.³⁶ Pseudo-Philo also mentions the sins of Adam and Eve as the introduction of death into the world (13.8–9), a tradition that becomes commonplace in Christian readings of Genesis, but one that did not receive as much attention in some Jewish circles (e.g. the community at Qumran; see the following paragraphs). All told, however, Eden or paradise mostly serves as a final destination for the righteous for Pseudo-Philo; nevertheless, the work of Pseudo-Philo appeals to both the narrative of the original Eden as well as an eschatological Eden, thus tying them together with a directness that is not always present in other Jewish literature. In this way, *Biblical Antiquities* is one of the clearest and most explicit examples from early Judaism of Eden serving as both *Urzeit* and *Endzeit*.³⁷

Adam in Pseudo-Philo's *Biblical Antiquities*," *JSJ* 23 (1992): 1–20. See also the commentary by Howard Jacobson (*A Commentary on Pseudo-Philo's Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum, with Latin Text and English Translation* [AGJU 31; 2 vols.; Leiden: Brill, 1996]). Harrington ("Pseudo-Philo" in *OTP* 2:299) dates Pseudo-Philo to the first century CE in part based on the expression "to this day" in 22:8 suggesting that the temple is still standing as the author writes this work.

³⁵ Bauckham, "Paradise in the *Biblical Antiquities* of Pseudo-Philo," 56. This is similar to 2 *Baruch* (4.3–6; 51.11).

³⁶ The twelve stones are the same as is found in Exod 28:17–20 and are related to the twelve tribes of Israel as found in Targum Neofiti; cf. Ezek 28:13 LXX.

³⁷ Another clear example of Eden as *Urzeit* and *Endzeit* comes from *Apoc. Ab.* 21.6–23.14 in which both an eschatological Eden and a primeval Eden are envisioned and described. For more, see below under "Eschatological Utopianism."

Regarding the library of the Dead Sea Scrolls, Florentino García Martínez has noted that there are very few texts that directly refer to or even echo the Eden narrative of Genesis 2–3.³⁸ He states that not only are fragments of the biblical text itself rare in the evidence from Qumran, but more interestingly, non-biblical texts that “expand, comment or simply rewrite the Eden stories” are almost entirely absent.³⁹ This, of course, stands in direct contrast to the vast numbers of expansions of other Genesis texts (specifically texts about Noah) found at Qumran.⁴⁰ Tigchelaar suggests that “there are several indications that the story of Adam and Eve in paradise was not very important or influential in the community.”⁴¹ He specifically cites the lack of interest in any of the forefathers before Noah in documents where one might expect them—the *Genesis Apocryphon*, the *Prayer of Enosh* (4Q369; 4Q499), and *4QAgnes of Creation* (4Q180)—noting that in the last of these, the sequence of the ages begins not with Adam but Noah.⁴²

Nevertheless, in the Scrolls one does find occasional references to some of the important characters of the Eden narrative. For example, CD III, 20, 1QS IV, 23 and 1QH IV, 15 all speak of the “glory of Adam” in an eschatological context. Similarly, 4Q171 refers to “the inheritance of Adam” and 11Q19 XXIX, 8–9 speaks of the “day of creation,” again in an eschatological

³⁸ Florentino García Martínez, “Man and Woman: Halakhah Based upon Eden in the Dead Sea Scrolls” in *Paradise Interpreted: Representations of Biblical Paradise in Judaism and Christianity* (ed. G. Luttikhuisen; Leiden: Brill, 1999), esp. 95–99.

³⁹ García Martínez, “Man and Woman,” 96; Tigchelaar, “Eden and Paradise,” 50. The Eden narrative is not entirely unknown in the Dead Sea Scrolls. See, e.g., 4Q303; 4Q305; 4Q422; 4Q423; 4Q504.

García Martínez speculates that one possible reason for the lack of interest in the Eden narrative at Qumran is its different approach to the origin of evil. He states that Qumran emphasizes the role of the watchers found in Genesis 6 and the Enochic literature. This helps explain the Scrolls’ emphasis on Noah over against Eden. Tigchelaar adds to García Martínez’s theory by noting that in the *Damascus Document* (II, 17; III, 1–12), the author lists “historical sinners in chronological order,” but rather than begin with Adam and Eve (or Cain), the author begins with the Watchers of Genesis 6 (“Eden and Paradise,” 51). In fact, Adam is invoked shortly after as representative of the glory experienced in the eschaton, not as a model for sin (“the glory of Adam,” CD III, 20). For more on the origins of evil according to the Scrolls, see García Martínez, “The Origin of Evil and the Dualistic Thought of the Sect,” in *Encyclopedia of Apocalypticism* (ed. J. J. Collins; vol. 1 of *Encyclopedia of Apocalypticism: The Origins of Apocalypticism in Judaism and Christianity*, ed. J. J. Collins; New York: Continuum, 2000), 162–92; Stone, *Ancient Judaism*, 31–58.

⁴⁰ For more on the Noachic literature at Qumran, see García Martínez, “Interpretation of the Flood in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in *Interpretations of the Flood* (Themes in Biblical Narrative 1; ed. F. García Martínez and G. Luttikhuisen; Leiden: Brill, 1998), 86–108.

⁴¹ Tigchelaar, “Eden and Paradise,” 50.

⁴² Tigchelaar, “Eden and Paradise,” 50.

context.⁴³ Finally, in 4Q265 is an interesting retelling of the Eden narrative in which Adam and Eve are described as being formed outside of the garden, and the garden itself is described as holy, two ideas shared with *Jubilees* 3.⁴⁴ One does not, however, find any vivid descriptions of Genesis 2–3 or retellings of these passages.⁴⁵ As with the Hebrew Scripture and a large segment of the Jewish tradition, the Dead Sea Scrolls do not appeal to the Eden narrative in any substantial way in order to answer the question, How did evil enter the world?⁴⁶ Similarly, the function and location of Eden, whether past, present or future, are of no concern to the authors of the Dead Sea Scrolls.⁴⁷

One final literary tradition that contributes to Edenic utopianism is the literature on Adam and Eve that appears beginning around the first century CE and is reworked over the following centuries—particularly *The Greek Life of Adam and Eve*⁴⁸ (hereafter *G.L.A.E.*) and its Latin version (hereafter *Vita*), a story told about Adam and Eve after their removal from Eden.⁴⁹ Drawing from the literature of Adam and Eve is not without

⁴³ Garcíá Martínez, “Man and Woman,” 98–99.

⁴⁴ Garcíá Martínez (“Man and Woman,” 109–14) links this passage to *Jubilees* 3 because both (uniquely) combine the Eden narrative with the Levitical laws of childbearing (Lev 12:2–5), suggesting that both the author of *Jubilees* and likely the community of the Dead Sea Scrolls equated Eden with the temple. 4QFlorilegium mentions the “Temple of man/Adam” (מקדש אדם) which, in light of 4Q265, now makes sense as “Temple of Adam.” See also Josephus (*Ant.* 1.38) for Adam and Eve being created outside the garden and then only later being brought in.

George Brooke has argued that this text (4Q265) and 4Q421 link together Eden and the Jerusalem temple, a fact supported by the author’s reliance on *Jubilees*, a document that clearly equates the two (“Miqdash Adam, Eden, and the Qumran Community,” 294–97).

⁴⁵ Admittedly, the one document in which a rewritten Eden account should be present, the *Genesis Apocryphon*, is missing its initial columns. Interestingly, also missing in the Qumran documents is the *Jubilees* fragment from *Jubilees* 3, the chapter that relates the Eden narrative, despite the presence of portions of chapters 2 and 4. Even granting these two lacunae in the data, the lack of interest in Genesis 2–3 throughout the Qumran literature is more than noticeable.

⁴⁶ For a discussion on the origins of evil according to Jewish tradition, see Stone (*Ancient Judaism*, 31–58) who argues that there was a large segment of Judaism (especially those people who composed the Dead Sea Scrolls) that appealed not to the Adam and Eve narrative but the story of the Watchers in Genesis 6 for their theological basis on the origins of sin and the nature of humanity.

⁴⁷ Thus the conclusion of Tigchelaar is on target: “Apart from 1 *Enoch* there is no apparent concern with the location and present or future function of Eden [in the texts found at Qumran]” (“Eden and Paradise,” 57).

⁴⁸ Sometimes this work is referred to as the *Apocalypse of Moses*. Since it clearly belongs in the larger tradition of the Lives of Adam and Eve, scholars have begun to title it as such.

⁴⁹ Up until recently, little work had been done on this complex of traditions. However, within the last twenty years scholarship has begun to pay more attention to the

problems, however, due to the difficulty of dating its various redactional stages and its complex literary history. Likely written in Greek and translated into Latin, Armenian, Georgian, and Slavonic, the text was clearly read by many and various peoples, but adding to the complication are multiple text forms and a confusing array of manuscripts.⁵⁰ Finally, the date of the document, portions of which extend well past 200 CE, is later than much of the work surveyed elsewhere in this study. Nevertheless, to exclude this document from research into Jewish traditions about Eden would be negligent in that it contains the most substantive considerations about the characters of Adam and Eve, characters that receive surprisingly little attention in other Jewish texts.

In conclusion, Jewish elaboration on the space of the primeval Eden is quite limited, while interest in the eschatological Eden dominates. Prior to the literature on Adam and Eve (*G.L.A.E.* and *Vita*), only *Jubilees*, Philo, Pseudo-Philo and to a lesser degree Josephus, show any interest in the specifics of the primeval Eden. Even they, however, do not give vivid elaborations of the text in a way that would add a cache of data for filling out the picture of utopia. Rarely do they go beyond the narrative as found in Genesis 2–3. Given the Jewish propensity for elaborating where Scripture is terse, one might have expected detailed descriptions of a pre-fallen world similar to the Greco-Roman interest in the Golden Age; perhaps a description of the physical aspects of the garden itself; a word about Adam and Eve's daily existence in the garden; a statement about whether Adam and Eve ever ate from the Tree of Life and if not, why; a description of the changes that occurred to the couple once leaving Eden; a word about the kind of food eaten in Eden, such as if they ate meat or if they were vegetarians; or a description of a life in which God is capable of walking in the garden with the first couple. If this is one's expectation,

literature on Adam and Eve, the charge largely led by Michael Stone and Gary Anderson *inter alia* (e.g. Stone, *A History of Literature of Adam and Eve* [Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992]; idem, *Armenian Apocrypha Relating to Adam and Eve* [Leiden: Brill, 1996]; Anderson and Stone, eds., *A Synopsis of the Books of Adam and Eve* [SBLEJL 17; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1999]; Anderson, Stone, and Tromp, eds., *Literature on Adam and Eve* [Leiden: Brill, 2000]; Johannes Tromp, *The Life of Adam and Eve in Greek: A Critical Edition* [PVTG 6; Leiden: Brill, 2005]). For a concise review of scholarship to 2004, see Wanda Zemler-Cizewski, "The Apocryphal Life of Adam and Eve: Recent Scholarly Work," *ATHR* 86 (2004): 671–77; and Tromp's history of research in *The Life of Adam and Eve in Greek*, 3–16.

⁵⁰ See Tromp, *The Life of Adam and Eve in Greek*, 67–107. For translations of each language side-by-side in a parallel format, see Anderson and Stone, eds., *A Synopsis of the Books of Adam and Eve*.

he or she will be sorely disappointed.⁵¹ Instead, what one mostly finds is allusion and echo rather than emphasis and elaboration.⁵²

3.2.2. *Nationalistic Utopianism*

Beavis suggests a category of utopian expression that contains “traditions depicting the Land of Israel (or some part of the land) or the nation of Israel in a given historical epoch in idealized terms.”⁵³ This category will be referred to as *nationalistic utopianism*. What is meant by *nationalistic* is the nation of Israel, whether the place or the people or sometimes both. Beavis uses “Israel” similarly (as people or place) and suggests two sub-categories that this study also adopts: *locative-temporal utopias* and *legal-covenantal utopias*. The former she defines as “traditions in which the land of Israel is portrayed in idealized terms (e.g., the Promised Land, the ‘land of milk and honey,’ Jerusalem, the Temple), and periods in the history of Israel as a nation portrayed in the Bible as ideal epochs (e.g., the time of Moses and Aaron, the kingdoms of David and Solomon, the return from exile).”⁵⁴ Included in this are “ideal maps” found in Scripture. Legal-covenantal utopias, on the other hand, are defined as “traditions portraying the Law of Moses founded on the covenant between God and

⁵¹ In other words, one should not expect to find intricate descriptions of Eden similar to the descriptions of the primitivistic worlds of the Greco-Roman tradition. And though Eden can serve as the first half of the *Urzeit/Endzeit* pattern, it does so only in vague and undefined terms. Thus while some apocalyptic traditions place Eden at both the beginning and the end of history, they do so without vivid description or explanation. See David E. Aune, “From the Idealized Past to the Imaginary Future: Eschatological Restoration in Jewish Apocalyptic Literature,” in *Apocalypticism, Prophecy and Magic in Early Christianity: Collected Essays* (WUNT 199; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006), 13–38, esp. 31–34.

⁵² Tigchelaar’s conclusion is on target: “The Genesis Eden narrative was wellknown [sic], and is sometimes referred to or alluded to in the preserved texts. It is noteworthy, though, that neither Adam or Eve, nor Paradise itself evoked much interest, while most of the mythological aspects of the story of Gen 2–3 are neglected altogether” (“Eden and Paradise,” 56).

On the other hand, Guy Stroumsa’s remarks need amending in light of the portrait of Second Temple Jewish traditions mapped out here. Remarkings on the differences between Greco-Roman myths of the Golden Age and the biblical Eden, Stroumsa states that “the various [Greek] myths of origins and of the Golden Age in the *Urzeit*, or various references to a ‘paradise’ of sorts did not have in the Greek tradition the power equivalent to that of the first chapters of Genesis in Judaism and in Christianity” (“Introduction: The Paradise Chronotope,” in *Paradise in Antiquity: Jewish and Christian Views* [M. Bockmuehl and G. Stroumsa; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010], 5). The Greco-Roman use of the Golden Age was as strong as, if not stronger than, Jewish uses of Eden (whether he is right about Christian uses of Eden is not here addressed).

⁵³ Beavis, *Jesus and Utopia*, 30.

⁵⁴ Beavis, *Jesus and Utopia*, 30–31.

Israel as the supreme template for the ideal theocratic state.”⁵⁵ Both subsections are necessary for creating a taxonomy of utopian expressions and will be used in what follows.

3.2.2.1. *Locative-Temporal Utopias*

This section addresses the place of Israel and Jerusalem/Zion as a site for utopia. Because of the innumerable mentions of Israel and Jerusalem/Zion in the Hebrew Scripture and later Jewish literature, and because of the vast amount of secondary literature on this subject,⁵⁶ this work limits the scope of the available data in two ways: first, by addressing descriptions of the land of Israel, the city of Jerusalem, or the new Jerusalem; second, by highlighting the expectation of a Davidic king.

Beavis notes that the Hebrew Scripture contains ideal “maps” that delineate the boundaries of Israel, the land God has blessed and promised to the people Israel, and the contours of that land—specifically Jerusalem and the temple. She casts Ezekiel’s description of the temple in such terms: “The vision of the new Jerusalem in Ezekiel 40–48 is the ‘utopian blueprint’ for an ideal, eschatological temple-state. The city is embedded in a consecrated space (*terumah*), extending from the Jordan River to the

⁵⁵ Beavis, *Jesus and Utopia*, 31.

⁵⁶ The following is a short bibliography of the more recent and most important books. Lois K. Fuller Dow, *Images of Zion: Biblical Antecedents for the New Jerusalem* (New Testament Monographs 26; Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2010); Lee I. Levine, *Jerusalem: Portrait of the City in the Second Temple Period (538 BCE–70 CE)* (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 2002); Richard S. Hess and Gordon J. Wenham, eds. *Zion, City of our God* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999); Leslie J. Hoppe, *The Holy City: Jerusalem in the Theology of the Old Testament* (Collegeville, Minn.: Liturgical Press, 2000); Richard J. Clifford, *The Cosmic Mountain in Canaan and the Old Testament* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1972); John Collins, *Jerusalem and the Temple in Jewish Apocalyptic Literature of the Second Temple Period* (International Rennert Guest Lecture Series 1; Ramat-Gan, Israel: Bar-Ilan University Press, 1998); Maria Leppäkari, *Apocalyptic Representations of Jerusalem* (SHR 3; Leiden: Brill, 2006); James Calvin de Young, *Jerusalem in the New Testament: The Significance of the City in the History of Redemption and in Eschatology* (Kampen: J. H. Kok, 1960); Philip R. Davies, “From Zion to Zion: Jerusalem in the Dead Sea Scrolls” in *Jerusalem in Ancient History and Tradition* (ed. T. Thompson; JSOTSup 381; London: T & T Clark, 2003), 164–70; Elizabeth Ann Gaines, “The Eschatological Jerusalem: The Function of the Image in the Literature of the Biblical Period” (Ph.D. diss., Princeton Theological Seminary, 1988); Lawrence H. Schiffman, “Jerusalem in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in *The Centrality of Jerusalem: Historical Perspectives* (M. Poorthuis and C. Safrai. Kampen; Netherlands: Kok Pharos, 1996), 73–88; Peter W. L. Walker, ed., *Jesus and the Holy City: New Testament Perspectives on Jerusalem* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996); Peter W. L. Walker, “The Land in the Apostles’ Writings,” in *The Land of Promise: Biblical, Theological and Contemporary Perspectives* (P. Johnston and P. Walker; Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity Press, 2000), 81–99.

Mediterranean Sea, separating the territories of Judah and Benjamin.”⁵⁷ And then again: “The utopian temple-state of Ezekiel’s vision is one of several biblical ‘maps’ of Israel that sketch the ideal contours of the land”;⁵⁸ other maps include the promise of the land in Gen 15:12–21 which outlines the boundaries of Israel’s land (cf. Exod 23:31; Deut 11:24), Num 34:1–35:15 which designates not only Israel’s borders but how it is to be apportioned among the tribes (cf. Deut 3:12–20), and Josh 13:1–21:45 which specifies in detail the territories not yet conquered and the division of land between the tribes; the passage ends with the statement: “Not one of all the good promises that the Lord had made to the house of Israel had failed; all came to pass” (Josh 21:45).⁵⁹ And as Beavis notes, though these boundaries and certainly this final statement are “anachronistic and idealizing,” because of the divine promise to which they are attached, “these boundaries are immutable, perfect, and eternal from a theological perspective, no matter how imperfect, changeable, and temporary ancient Israel’s historical borders actually were.”⁶⁰

Further, part and parcel of the locative-temporal utopia is Israel’s idealizing of the Davidic and Solomonic eras and the hope of a return to this golden age. A future Davidic king, often a messianic figure, is expected as part of this return to utopia. Beavis writes:

In the exilic era, united Israel, with its legendary kings and glorious Temple, serves as a “primeval prototype” of an idealized future world. In the utopian realm proclaimed by the prophets, a wise and just king from the line of David will not only reign in Jerusalem but will serve as a beacon of peace to all nations (e.g., Isa 9:6–7; 11:1–5, 10; 16:4–5; 32:1–2; Jer 23:5–6; Mic 5:1–4a; cf. Ps 72:2–7; Ezek 37:24–28). The prophets contemporary with the return from exile under Zerubbabel interpret him as the anointed one who will restore national fortunes to the monarchical ideal (Zech 3:8; 6:12; Hag 2:22–23).⁶¹

In Second Temple literature, the expectation of a Davidic King and a return to Israel’s golden age is only heightened. The *Psalms of Solomon*, for example, have a lengthy address concerning the Davidic King who is to come and usher in an era of peace (*Pss. Sol.* 17.21–46; cf. 18.1–12).⁶²

⁵⁷ Beavis, *Jesus and Utopia*, 42.

⁵⁸ Beavis, *Jesus and Utopia*, 42.

⁵⁹ Beavis, *Jesus and Utopia*, 43.

⁶⁰ Beavis, *Jesus and Utopia*, 44.

⁶¹ Beavis, *Jesus and Utopia*, 39–40. See also David Jobling, “‘Forced Labor’: Solomon’s Golden Age and the Question of Literary Representation,” *Semeia* 54 (1991): 57–76.

⁶² The *Psalms of Solomon* are likely dated to the first century BCE (R. B. Wright, “Psalms of Solomon,” in *OTP* 2:640–42).

The *Testament of Levi* also contains a messianic figure, with both priestly and kingly attributes, in whose time “there shall be peace in all the earth” (18.3; cf. *T. Dan* 5.9, 11).⁶³ And finally, *2 Baruch* envisions a messianic figure that will bring in a new age that is marked by the rise of Israel, the defeat of the nations, and “eternal peace” as the Messiah sits on the “throne of the kingdom” (*2 Bar.* 72.1–74.3).

3.2.2.2. *Legal-Covenantal Utopias*

Three aspects of legal-covenantal utopianism are here addressed: the Sabbath laws, the year of Jubilee, and the communities of the Therapeutai and the Essenes. The first two are laws found in the Torah and thus fit quite naturally into the legal-covenantal category. The utopian communities, however, will require some explanation as to why they should be included here.⁶⁴

The sabbatical laws are an attempt to transform this world, in its present state, into a utopia here and now. The Sabbath creates a space in which work and leisure are balanced through calendrical structure. It is a means of ordering life creating space for regular worship of and meditation on the Creator. Uffenheimer states that “the ancient Israelite lawgiver aimed at overcoming the shortcomings of the cyclical time, which is governed by the mortal rhythm of nature. The new rhythm he establishes was based on general recreation and regeneration. Insofar as this rhythm related to Sabbath rest it was conceived as a collective social imitation of the Creator’s rest.”⁶⁵

Furthermore, as Beavis notes, the laws concerning the sabbatical year (*Deut* 15:1–18) “limit slavery, provide for the remission of debts, and stipulate an agricultural fallow year in seven-year cycles, reflecting the weekly

⁶³ The *Testament of Levi* is part of the larger work, the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, which H. C. Kee dates to the second century BCE (“Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs,” 1:775–81. Dating this document, however, is complicated by the unmistakable Christian interpolations that appear periodically throughout the work leading many early scholars to believe that this is actually a Christian document (cf. Marinus de Jonge, *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: A Study of their Text, Composition and Origin* [2d ed.; Assen: Van Gorcum, 1975], 508). The text is now widely understood to be a Jewish document with Christian interpolations, the final form of which is fixed no later than 200 CE when it is cited by Origen.

⁶⁴ Uffenheimer, “Utopia and Reality,” 3–15; Collins, “Models of Utopia,” 53; Beavis, *Jesus and Utopia*, 44–48. In Collins’ categorical system, he separates out utopian communities from other forms of utopian expression (“Models of Utopia,” 52). Beavis, however, is less clear on where the communities fit into her categories despite devoting an entire chapter to these communities (*Jesus and Utopia*, 30–31, 53–70).

⁶⁵ Uffenheimer, “Utopia and Reality in Biblical Thought,” 14.

rhythm of the Sabbath.”⁶⁶ The sabbatical year requires the society to function in such a way that the poor are cared for and those in need are tended to. When linked to the priestly depiction of creation in Genesis 1, the sabbatical laws embody the utopian vision of creation as it should be, a creation in which all is God’s and both work and rest are necessary elements of “life as it should be.”⁶⁷

Similarly, the year of Jubilee (Leviticus 25) is primarily concerned with structuring society in a way that creates opportunity for the “least of these” to move out of poverty. The year of Jubilee is a time when debts are forgiven, slaves are freed, and the land is returned to its owner. The utopian nature of this command is immediately clear. Whether or not the year of Jubilee was actually practiced among Israelites and Jews is a matter of debate, but as Beavis notes, it is clearly echoed in the eschatological vision of Isaiah in which the Lord’s anointed brings good news to the oppressed, binds the brokenhearted, frees captives and prisoners, proclaims the year of the Lord’s favor, and comforts those who mourn (Isa 61:1–2).⁶⁸

Finally, this study argues that literary descriptions of the Therapeutai⁶⁹ and the Essenes⁷⁰ fit well in the category of legal-covenantal utopias due to both groups’ intense study of and meditation on their sacred writings.

⁶⁶ Beavis, *Jesus and Utopia*, 44; cf. Uffenheimer, “Utopia and Reality in Biblical Thought,” 4–5.

⁶⁷ See below under the *topos* “Attitude toward Work.”

⁶⁸ Beavis, *Jesus and Utopia*, 46; cf. Sharon H. Ringe, *Jesus, Liberation, and the Biblical Jubilee: Images for Ethics and Christology* (Overtures to Biblical Theology; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1985), 29.

⁶⁹ The Therapeutai are only mentioned by Philo in *De Vita Contemplativa* (*On the Contemplative Life*). As with the Essenes, this study is more interested in Philo’s literary depiction of this group than the historical group itself (see the following footnote). For more on the Therapeutai, see Beavis, “Philo’s Therapeutai: Philosopher’s Dream or Utopian Construction”; Troels Engberg-Pederson, “Philo’s *De Vita Contemplativa* as a Philosopher’s Dream,” *JSJ* 30 (1999): 40–64; D. M. Hay, “Fails for the Therapeutae: References to Other Texts and Persons in Philo’s *De Vita Contemplativa*,” in *Neotestamentica et Philonica* (ed. D. Aune, T. Seland, and J. H. Ulrichsen; Leiden: Brill, 2003), 330–48; idem, “Things Philo Said and Did Not Say about the Therapeutae,” in *SBL Seminar Papers, 1992* (SBLSP 31; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992), 673–83; Joan E. Taylor and Philip R. Davies, “The So-Called Therapeutae of *De Vita Contemplativa*: Identity and Character,” *HTR* 91 (1998): 3–24.

⁷⁰ A discussion of the Essenes is complicated by the disputed (though mostly accepted) hypothesis that the community at Qumran was an Essene community. For a full-scale historical reconstruction of the historical Essenes, one must turn elsewhere. This study is interested in the literary representations of the Essenes as found in Philo (*Prob.* 75–91; *Hypoth.* 11.1–18), Josephus (*Ant.* 18.18–22; *J.W.* 2.119–161), and Pliny (*Nat.* 5.17.4). These authors tend to paint the group in utopian terms that the group itself may or may not have fully embraced. The question of the historical Essenes, therefore, must be shelved for the moment as we consider the literary descriptions given in Philo, Josephus, and Pliny.

Thus Philo describes the Therapeutai as a utopian group dedicated to the contemplation of the law and to the contemplative life—*De Vita Contemplativa*—through which one gains mystical access to the knowledge of God and is formed in perfection. That this group's defining feature includes the contemplation of Scripture and on nature fits well with the category of legal-covenantal utopianism. Similarly, both Philo and Josephus describe the Essenes as a group dedicated to the study of the law and the "writings of the ancients."⁷¹

Philo records that the Therapeutai are a people living in a monastic setting in a remote part of Egypt, near Alexandria beyond the Moreatic Lake. Despite the fact that Philo's *De Vita Contemplativa* does not fit neatly into the other categories of utopian expression—i.e., Eden is nowhere mentioned, Jerusalem and the land of Israel is of no consequence, and the afterlife is not in view—his description of the group can nevertheless be called utopian as it touches upon all but three of the *topoi* mentioned below (see Appendix B). Beavis notes many striking resemblances between this work and Iambulus' Islands of the Sun (Diodorus Siculus 2.55–59).⁷² She comments on the following: location and climate, diet, dress, marriage and child-rearing, testing of children, dining habits, leadership, love of learning, association with healing, physical peculiarities, absence of slavery, association of the divine with the sun, hymn singing, numerology, love of harmony, simplicity, and blessed existence. Admittedly, some of Beavis' correlations are strained.⁷³ But despite a few objections to specific aspects of her comparison, Beavis is right to compare these two societies in that they do share a remarkable number of utopian characteristics.

⁷¹ Philo, *Prob.* 80; Josephus, *J.W.* 2.136, 145, 159.

⁷² See especially Beavis, "Philo's Therapeutai." Also, a revised (and shortened) version of this article appears in ch. 3 of *Jesus and Utopia*, 58–66.

⁷³ For example, under the category "love of harmony," she conflates two English meanings of *harmony*, the musical connotation and the absence of strife (Beavis, "Philo's Therapeutai," 39). Philo speaks about the former while Iambulus the latter. In another example, she slyly compares the "physical peculiarities" of the two groups by failing to mention just how peculiar Iambulus' Heliopolitans are: their bones are capable of bending and becoming straight again, their grasp is unusually tight, they have no hair except on their heads, eyebrows, eyelids and chins, they are "remarkably beautiful and well-proportioned," and their ears are more spacious with closeable valves, and their tongues are such that they are capable of holding two conversations simultaneously (Diodorus Siculus, 2.56.2–6). So how does Beavis compare this to the Therapeutai? She writes, "Philo says that the most rigorous devotees 'have become habituated to abstinence like the grasshoppers who are said to live on air . . . ' (*Vit. Cont.* 35), that is, through self-discipline, they have become physically unlike the majority of humankind" ("Philo's Therapeutai," 38; verbatim in *Jesus and Utopia*, 64). This comparison is untenable.

The Essenes are described with equally utopian imagery as are the Therapeutai, as noted by Doron Mendels in his work comparing the Essenes (as known through Philo, Josephus, and the writings from the DSS) with Iambulus' Island of the Sun.⁷⁴ The success of Mendel's essay is only limited by the brevity of his article. He adduces a series of interesting parallels between the Hellenistic utopia of Iambulus and that of the Essenes including, for example, their isolated locations, concern for relational harmony, the lack of private property, common meals, and asceticism.⁷⁵ Both Philo and Josephus characterize the Essenes as a particularly virtuous people with Josephus going so far as to say that such a degree of righteousness has "never [been] found before among any Greek or barbarian people, nay, not even briefly" (*Ant.* 18.20 [Feldman, LCL]).⁷⁶ Philo, Josephus, and Pliny all describe them as eschewing wealth and instead keeping all things in common,⁷⁷ a feature of their group that keeps all members happy and food in abundance.⁷⁸ Finally, according to Philo the Essenes are pacifists (*Prob.* 76, 78; cf. Josephus, *J.W.* 2.139).

In conclusion, the category of nationalistic utopianism works on two levels: Israel as defined as space (locative-temporal) and Israel as defined as people (legal-covenantal). The locative nature of Jewish utopianism is prevalent in both the Hebrew Scripture and the traditions that stem from it. Legal-covenantal utopianism, while not as prevalent, can be found in some of the legal literature of the Torah (particularly Deut 8:1–20; 11:8–25; and Lev 25:1–26:13) as well as exhibited in the utopian communities of the Essenes and the Therapeutai.

⁷⁴ Mendels, "Hellenistic Utopia and the Essenes"; cf. Beavis, *Jesus and Utopia*, 54–58. Prior to Mendels, Lovejoy and Boas already recognize the utopian qualities of Philo's description of the Essenes: "The Essenes in this account approach the conditions of life in the Golden Age in their great virtue, their rural felicity, their pacifism, their economic primitivism, and their communism" (Arthur O. Lovejoy and George Boas, *Primitivism and Related Ideas in Antiquity* [vol. 1 of *A Documentary History of Primitivism and Related Ideas*; ed. A. O. Lovejoy, G. Chinard, G. Boas, and R. S. Crane; Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1935], 354).

⁷⁵ He includes other motifs that are less convincing. For example, he argues that both groups do not marry, a fact that may be true from a surface reading but with the slightest scrutiny is entirely problematic given that the citizens of the Island of the Sun share women in common while the Essenes are said to eschew sexual relationships altogether (Mendels, "Hellenistic Utopia and the Essenes," 215–16).

⁷⁶ See also Josephus, *J.W.* 2.128; Philo, *Prob.* 75; *Hypoth.* 11.2.

⁷⁷ Josephus, *Ant.* 18.20; *J.W.* 2.122, 127; Philo, *Prob.* 76–78, 86, 91; *Hypoth.* 11.4; Pliny, *Nat.* 5.17.4.

⁷⁸ Josephus, *J.W.* 2.127–131, 133; Philo, *Prob.* 86, 91; *Hypoth.* 11.5. See also Gabrielle Boccacini, *Beyond the Essene Hypothesis: The Parting of the Ways between Qumran and Enochic Judaism* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), 32–33.

3.2.3. Eschatological Utopianism

My use of the term *eschatology* and its derivatives should not be confused with a precise theological or systematic definition of “the last things,” the end of history, or the like.⁷⁹ Instead, eschatology as used here and throughout is defined broadly to indicate a future utopian age that stands in contrast to the present age and is often akin to an Edenic age; i.e. the eschaton is the *Endzeit* to Eden’s *Urzeit*.⁸⁰ As Cornelius also defines it, the eschaton is “the hope of a coming new age, which need not be a-historical or the end of history.”⁸¹

The need for a broader definition of eschatology is seen most clearly in light of the discussion surrounding the differences between prophetic eschatology and apocalyptic eschatology. Such a differentiation has become standard in Second Temple studies beginning with Paul Hanson’s *The Dawn of Apocalyptic*. Hanson has argued that the main distinction between prophetic and apocalyptic eschatology is that the former deals in “plain history” while the latter conceives of the world through mythical language.⁸² Hanson has rightly been critiqued on his use of myth and history since both prophetic and apocalyptic writers can appeal to both the mythical and the historical.⁸³ Grabbe has been a voice cutting against

⁷⁹ Emmanuel Uchenna Dim distinguishes between what he calls a narrower and broader definition of eschatology (*The Eschatological Implications of Isa 65 and 66 as the Conclusion of the Book of Isaiah* [Bible in History 3; Bern: Peter Lang, 2005]). The former he defines as the theological doctrine of the end of history and the beginning of a new reality of time eternal. Quoting Ernst Jenni, he defines eschatology in its broader sense as “a future in which the circumstances of history are changed to such an extent that one can speak of a new, entirely different, state of things, without, in so doing, necessarily leaving the framework of history” (Dim, *Eschatological Implications*, 214–15, cf. 8–15; Jenni, “Eschatology of the OT,” in *The Interpreter’s Dictionary of the Bible* (ed., G. A. Buttrick; 4 vols.; Nashville: Abingdon, 1962), 2:126). Clearly this study is working under the broader definition.

⁸⁰ To clarify, however, even this way of understanding eschatology (as a partner to Eden) is not always accurate because much eschatological reflection in both biblical and extra-biblical Jewish literature does not use Eden as a prototype for the age to come.

⁸¹ Cornelius, “Paradise Motifs in the ‘Eschatology’ of the Minor Prophets and the Iconography of the Ancient Near East: The Concepts of Fertility, Water, Trees, and ‘Tierfrieden’ and Gen 2–3,” *JNWSL* 14 (1988): 43. David Petersen’s definition is also helpful: “a form of radical orientation to the future, which may involve a sort of social and/or cosmic arrangement fundamentally different from that which currently exists” (“Eschatology (OT),” *ABD* 2:576). Cf. Bill Arnold, “Old Testament Eschatology and the Rise of Apocalypticism,” in *The Oxford Handbook of Eschatology* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), 24.

⁸² Paul Hanson, *The Dawn of Apocalyptic: The Historical and Sociological Roots of Jewish Apocalyptic Eschatology* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1975), 11.

⁸³ On the problems of history versus myth, see J. J. M. Roberts, “Myth versus History: Relaying the Comparative Foundations,” in *The Bible and the Ancient Near East: Collected*

the grain of scholarship by suggesting that the differences between apocalyptic and prophetic eschatology have been overstated and later apocalyptic eschatology belongs as a subset of the category of the prophetic, essentially collapsing the two into one.⁸⁴ Where Grabbe ultimately fails, however, is that though he wishes to argue for the essential oneness of prophetic and apocalyptic eschatologies, he still maintains that they are indeed different and that one is a subset of the other, but he does not state how the apocalyptic subset differs from other subsets within prophetic eschatology.⁸⁵ He, therefore, pushes the conversation into new categories but does not resolve the burning question: How does prophetic eschatology differ from apocalyptic eschatology?

In order to answer this, Collins' distinction is most helpful. He writes, "The distinctive feature of apocalyptic eschatology over against that of the prophets is the expectation of the post-mortem judgment of individuals."⁸⁶ Two essential differences, therefore, arise. First, in the Hebrew Scripture, eschatology is always at the level of the community (Israel). The idea of a *personal* punishment or reward is of little interest in the eschatological schema of the Hebrew Scripture. Second, the notion that an individual can expect reward or punishment *after death*—an idea often closely connected to resurrection and eternal damnation—is one not found in the Hebrew Scripture but is ubiquitous in early Judaism.

The term eschatology, therefore, will act as an umbrella term encompassing the variety of ways Israel has conceived of the utopian future.

Essays (Winona Lake, In.: Eisenbrauns, 2002), 60–66; John J. Collins, "Apocalyptic Eschatology in the Ancient World," in *The Oxford Handbook of Eschatology* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), 43–44; idem, "Apocalyptic Eschatology as the Transcendence of Death," *CBQ* 36 (1974): 21–43; Lester L. Grabbe, "Prophetic and Apocalyptic: Time for New Definitions—and New Thinking," in *Knowing the End from the Beginning: The Prophetic, the Apocalyptic and Their Relationships* (ed. L. L. Grabbe and R. D. Haak; JSPSup 46; New York: T&T Clark, 2003), 112–13. The old categories of myth versus history are still used by some (see recently Job Jindo ["On Myth and History in Prophetic and Apocalyptic Eschatology," *VT* 55 (2005): 412–15] who is critiqued by DiTommaso for not acknowledging the historical nature of apocalypses ["History and Apocalyptic Eschatology: A Reply to J. Y. Jindo," *NovT* 51 (2006): 413–18]).

⁸⁴ Lester L. Grabbe, "Introduction and Overview," in *Knowing the End from the Beginning: The Prophetic, the Apocalyptic and Their Relationships* (eds. L. Grabbe and R. Haak; JSPSup 46; New York: T&T Clark, 2003), 16–24.

⁸⁵ As Collins puts it, "If apocalyptic/apocalypse is a subdivision of prophecy, it must be in some way distinct from other prophetic writings, and the question of its distinctiveness remains" ("Prophecy, Apocalypse and Eschatology: Reflections on the Proposals of Lester Grabbe," in *Knowing the End from the Beginning: The Prophetic, the Apocalyptic and Their Relationships* [eds. L. Grabbe and R. Haak; JSPSup 46; New York: T&T Clark, 2003], 50).

⁸⁶ Collins, "Prophecy, Apocalypse and Eschatology," 49–50.

Eschatology, as used here, is an attempt to encompass all ancient Israelite and early Jewish conceptions of how the coming of a future age will restore a disordered world. Because of the differences that exist between the Hebrew Scripture's eschatology and that of the Second Temple literature, what follows will proceed by treating the topic in two parts: eschatology in the Hebrew Scripture and eschatology in early Judaism.

3.2.3.1. *Eschatology in the Hebrew Scripture*⁸⁷

Scholars have long been perplexed by the perceived "silence" about the afterlife in the Hebrew Scripture. When one compares the evidence for an afterlife in the Hebrew Scripture with the Mesopotamian and Egyptian cultures of its day as well as with later Jewish and Christian literature from the Second Temple period, all of which evidence considerable thought about the afterlife, the dearth of information is striking. The relative

⁸⁷ The bibliography for eschatology in the Hebrew Scripture is enormous. The following is a collection of the recent and/or most important works. Desmond Alexander, "The Old Testament View of Life After Death," *Them* 11.2 (1986): 41–46; Arnold, "Old Testament Eschatology"; James Barr, *The Garden of Eden and the Hope of Immortality* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1993); Collins, "Apocalyptic Eschatology in the Ancient World"; Stephen Cook, "Funerary Practices and Afterlife Expectations in Ancient Israel," *Religion Compass* 1 (2007): 660–83; Richard Elliot Friedman and Shawna Dolansky Overton, "Death and Afterlife: The Biblical Silence," in *Judaism in Late Antiquity, Part 4: Death, Life-after Death, Resurrection and the World-to-Come in the Judaisms of Antiquity* (ed. A. J. Avery-Peck and J. Neusner; Leiden: Brill, 2000), 35–59; John Goldingay, "Death and Afterlife in the Psalms," in *Judaism in Late Antiquity, Part 4: Death, Life-after Death, Resurrection and the World-to-Come in the Judaisms of Antiquity* (ed. A. J. Avery-Peck and J. Neusner; Leiden: Brill, 2000), 61–86; Donald E. Gowan, *Eschatology in the Old Testament* (2d ed.; London: T&T Clark, 2000); Grabbe, "Prophetic and Apocalyptic"; Lester L. Grabbe and Robert D. Haak, eds., *Knowing the End from the Beginning: The Prophetic, the Apocalyptic and Their Relationships* (JSPSup 46; New York: T&T Clark, 2003); Rachel S. Hallote, *Death, Burial, and Afterlife in the Biblical World: How the Israelites and Their Neighbors Treated the Dead* (Chicago: Ivan R. Dee, 2001); Philip S. Johnston, "Afterlife," in *Dictionary of the Old Testament: Wisdom, Poetry, and Writings* (ed. T. Longman III and P. Enns; Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity Press, 2008); idem, *Shades of Sheol: Death and Afterlife in the Old Testament* (Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity, 2002); Roland Murphy, "Death and Afterlife in the Wisdom Literature," in *Judaism in Late Antiquity, Part 4: Death, Life-after Death, Resurrection and the World-to-Come in the Judaisms of Antiquity* (ed. A. J. Avery-Peck and J. Neusner; Leiden: Brill, 2000), 101–16; Routledge, "Death and Afterlife in the Old Testament," *Journal of European Baptist Studies* 3 (2003): 22–39; Alan F. Segal, *Life after Death: A History of the Afterlife in the Religions of the West* (New York: Doubleday, 2004), 120–70; Klass Spronk, *Beatific Afterlife in Ancient Israel and the Ancient Near East* (Vluyn: Verlag Butzon and Bercker Kevelaer, 1986); Binyamin Uffenheimer, "From Prophetic to Apocalyptic Eschatology," in *Eschatology in the Bible and in Jewish and Christian Tradition* (ed. H. G. Reventlow; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997); J. Edward Wright, *The Early History of Heaven*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), 52–97; N. T. Wright, *The Resurrection of the Son of God* (vol. 3 of *Christian Origins and the Question of God*; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2003), 85–128.

silence about the afterlife is not only puzzling, but it also poses a significant problem for reconstructing ancient Israelite beliefs about the matter. Because of this, one must recognize that all reconstructions have a high level of speculation; nevertheless, through textual and archaeological facts, one can offer a tenable solution.⁸⁸

What is here referred to as the traditional view of scholarship is the argument that ancient Israelites had little interest in the afterlife as evidenced by the nearly entire neglect of the issue throughout the Hebrew Scripture.⁸⁹ Johnston, whose work challenges the traditional view, describes it this way:

For most of the OT, death leads to a shadowy, insubstantial existence in the underworld, called Sheol. There, all are reduced to somnolent inactivity, with no prospect of improvement or escape (Job 3:17–20; 7:9; 17:16 [despite Job's hypothetical wish in Job 14:13]). In particular, the underworld's denizens are cut off from Yahweh and can no longer offer praise or petition: "In death there is no memory of you; in Sheol who will praise you?" (Ps 6:5 [cf. Ps 88:5]). Thus persistence in Sheol is closer to "non-life" than afterlife.⁹⁰

⁸⁸ See Segal (*Life after Death*, 123) who makes a similar statement. Speculating on why there is an absence of discussion regarding the afterlife, Segal states, "The Bible's dislike of foreign cults and gods other than YHWH demythologized all the gods, turning them into created objects. Presumably, any extended discussion of life after death or the realm of the dead with its pantheon of divinities would open the door for idolatry or veneration of ghosts which the Bible, in its final and present form, has entirely forbidden" (*Life after Death*, 124). Continuing, he argues that given the context of ancient Canaanite, Mesopotamian, and Egyptian beliefs, all of which had much more vivid expectations about the afterlife, Israel likely developed a polemic against the beliefs of these cultures as a way of distinguishing themselves from the cultures around them. The need to distinguish themselves from others may have led Israel to scrub any discussion about the afterlife from the final form of the text. While this theory is plausible, it is still a matter of speculation, as Segal himself recognizes.

⁸⁹ For an excellent review of scholarship through 1986, see Klaas Spronk, *Beatific Afterlife*, 25–83. For representative examples of the traditional view, see Lloyd R. Bailey, Sr., *Biblical Perspectives on Death* (OBT; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1979), 45–47; Christoph Barth, *Die Errettung vom Tode in den individuellen Klage- und Dankliedern des Alten Testaments* (Zollikon: Evangelischer Verlag, 1947), 76–122; Walther Eichrodt, *Theology of the Old Testament* (2 vols.; OTL; tr. J. A. Baker; Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1961–1967), 2:210–28; Hallote, *Death, Burial, and Afterlife*, 52–53; Robert Martin-Achard, *From Death to Life: A Study of the Development of the Doctrine of the Resurrection in the Old Testament* (Edinburgh: Oliver & Boyd, 1960), 36–40; Nicholas J. Tromp, *Primitive Conceptions of Death and the Nether World in the Old Testament* (BibOr 21; Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1969), 176–99.

⁹⁰ Johnston, "Afterlife," 5; cf. Murphy, "Death and Afterlife in the Wisdom Literature," 101–102. Murphy, who, unlike Johnston, accepts the traditional view, describes it as follows: "What reality awaited the dead Israelite? The answer: 'non-life.' This 'non-life' is described as a condition or a place that is generally called sheol and usually localized in the belly of the earth" (101). He goes on to contrast the nature of life and the state of being after

The most one finds about life after death in the biblical witness is a few references to Sheol, a realm where all will dwell after death whether righteous or unrighteous in this life. Though the biblical authors speak of Sheol as a place, it is not a place where life, in any meaningful sense of the word, exists. Furthermore, the traditional view typically locates a sea-change in thinking during the second century BCE at which time Persian, and likely Greek, influences introduced the idea of a personal afterlife in which the righteous go to a blessed existence while the wicked go to a place of torment.⁹¹

Other scholars, however, have attempted to shift the conversation by suggesting that ancient Israelites may have had more interest in the after-life than once recognized.⁹² Though most scholars agree that Dan 12:1–3

death: “One cannot speak of ‘afterlife’ without agreeing on the usage of the term, ‘life.’ In the wisdom literature, life means significantly more than biological life, although ‘length of days’ (Prov. 3:2), as opposed to a premature death, is considered one of the blessings that result from wise conduct. A true measure of life is its quality: dignity, prestige, reputation, prosperity, a large family. This ambience constitutes real life for a person; life is a network of proper relationships to God, to other human beings, and to nature. . . . By contrast, these characteristics are not to be found in descriptions of sheol” (102).

⁹¹ A brief word about Hebrew cosmology is worthwhile (see esp. Wright, *The Early History of Heaven*, 52–97). In the Hebrew Scripture, the heavens is not a place for humans but is the abode of the divine. Psalm 115:16 is paradigmatic: “The heavens are the LORD’s heavens, but the earth he has given to human beings.” Expressed here is the ancient notion that the realm of God and the realm of humanity are two distinct realms, the heavens for God and the earth for humans, though it is often exclaimed that God is the creator and ruler of both (e.g. Pss 57:5; 69:34; 135:6).

Apart from heaven and earth is a third realm, Sheol. The term Sheol is used sixty-six times in the Hebrew Scripture. Though its etymology is unclear, the word can be used as both a signifier of the grave in general (thus, the NIV prefers the translation of “grave” for Sheol) and the place where the dead go upon death. It is inappropriate to translate Sheol as “hell”, as the King James Version does frequently, because Sheol is different from New Testament and Second Temple Jewish understandings of hell if for no other reason than the righteous are present and the Hebrew Scripture does not describe Sheol as a place of punishment (Johnston, *Shades of Sheol*, 73). Like the Hades of early Greek authors, Sheol is described as a place for *all* the dead without exception, both righteous and unrighteous alike. It is a dark place (Ps 88:6), a place of silence (Pss 94:17; 115:17), and a place that typically is characterized by separation from God (Pss 6:6; 88:5, 12; Isa 38:18; Jonah 2:5; cp. Ps 139:8, though this is likely meant to convey God’s over the entirety of the cosmos; for other examples of this sentiment see Job 11:8; 26:5; Prov 15:11; Isa 7:11; Amos 9:2).

⁹² See Routledge (“Death and Afterlife in the Old Testament”) for a recent survey of the field in this regard. In particular, he interacts primarily with Johnston, *Shades of Sheol*; Jon D. Levenson, *Resurrection and the Restoration of Israel: The Ultimate Victory of the God of Life* (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 2006); and Cook, “Funerary Practices and Afterlife Expectations in Ancient Israel.”

Some of these scholars even challenge the long-held notion that Sheol is for both the righteous and unrighteous. Johnston concludes that Sheol is not a place for all the dead but is only spoken of as a terrible place for the unrighteous (*Shades of Sheol*, 83). Similarly, Routledge (echoing Levenson) agrees that Sheol is a place reserved for those who die outside of God’s blessing. He states, “Where . . . death comes at the end of a life that is fulfilled

is the first clear articulation of a resurrection from the dead, some argue that the seeds for belief in a resurrection are latent in other passages from the Hebrew Scripture (most importantly Isa 26:19; Ezek 37:7–10; Hos 6:2). Johnston, for example, does not deny that other outside influences may have helped lead to the kind of resurrection present in Daniel but says that, because certain biblical passages were already hinting at such, “Israel’s resurrection belief emerged as distinctively Israelite.”⁹³ While attempts at entirely upending the traditional notion of Israel’s afterlife have been unsuccessful,⁹⁴ it is appropriate to recognize that texts contain latent meaning, and with regard to a beatific afterlife, the Hebrew

and blessed with descendants, there is no reference to Sheol; and the prospect of death is not feared as much as might be expected if the misery associated with Sheol was the only thing to look forward to” (“Death and Afterlife in the Old Testament,” 30). Levenson says passages like Ps 88:49 (“Who can live and never see death? Who can escape the power of Sheol?”) reflects an older view (cf. Eccl 9:10). Furthermore, these scholars point to the forbidding of necromancy as suggestive that life after death was conceived of as possible (A list of verses includes: Lev 19:31; 20:6, 27; Deut 18:11; 2 Kgs 21:6; 23:24; 1 Chr 10:13; 2 Chr 33:6; Isa 8:19; 19:3). As Segal puts it, “Necromancy forbidden is necromancy affirmed” (*Life after Death*, 126). The classic example of Saul and the witch of Endor (1 Sam 28:6–25) is an important piece of ammunition in the arsenal of those wishing to upend the traditional view.

The biggest challenge to the claim that Sheol is for the unrighteous, and one that has not been adequately dealt with, is that the Hebrew Scripture makes no mention of what happens to the righteous. The Hebrew Scripture, then, contains sixty-six references to Sheol and none to the place of the righteous dead. In an attempt to alleviate this problem, Levenson points to the importance of the family (*Resurrection*, 73–74), and Routledge cites the few passages that speak of death as being gathered to one’s people or fathers (Routledge, “Death and Afterlife in the Old Testament,” 31; cf. Cook [“Funerary Practices”] who wishes to make this point even more forcefully than Levenson and Routledge. To the evidence from the text, Cook adds funerary rites in African cultures that are similar to those of ancient Israel to demonstrate the importance of burial with one’s family for life beyond the grave).

If, however, ancient Israel did distinguish between the righteous and unrighteous dead, one would expect more reflection on the nature of the blessed afterlife, reflection that is simply not present in the Hebrew Scripture. At the very least one would expect a name for this place. Even Routledge, who throughout his essay attempts to upend the traditional notion of a limited interest in the afterlife, must say that any passages that are suggestive of a beatific afterlife are “too rare and too ambiguous to suggest the belief in Israel of an afterlife in the presence of God.” He continues, “At best, they express a feeling after something more than the shadowy netherworld of Sheol—to which the faithful servants of God and those who oppress them are dispatched without distinction, and where a lifetime of communion with God is brought to an abrupt end. This feeling after an alternative to Sheol, which is highlighted in recent research, may also be indicated by the significance of burial practices, and the suggestion of continued fellowship with family members after death. However, no significant attempt is made to set out an alternative—suggesting, in line with the older view, that the matter was not of overriding importance” (“Death and Afterlife in the Old Testament,” 38).

⁹³ Johnston, *Shades of Sheol*, 237.

⁹⁴ See footnote 92 above.

Scripture has passages that certainly could be read this way (specifically Isaiah 25–26 and Ezekiel 37).⁹⁵ Whether the author intended them to be read in such a way is doubtful, but that they were appropriated in this way by later Jewish writers—writers whose worldview assumed the notions of eternal punishment and reward—is not surprising.

Eschatology in the Hebrew Scripture, therefore, is not personal but corporate. Particularly as one finds it in the prophets, eschatology is focused on the reconstitution of Israel, both its people and place, at a future date. In contrast to apocalyptic eschatology discussed below, it is not the people to whom the prophet speaks that should expect to experience the hopeful message of Israel's reconstitution (perhaps in an afterlife), it is their future ancestors after they have returned to the dust, never to live again.

In prophetic eschatology, descriptions of the blessed life are typically cast in contradistinction to exilic life. The prophet casts a vision of an Israel that has returned from exile often crossing deserts, valleys, and mountains to get there. Descriptions of the reconstituted Israel are often pastoral in setting⁹⁶ and exhibit utopian descriptions of a good life. These descriptions include, *inter alia*, an abundance of food and wine, a lack of war, and the presence of YHWH among the people Israel.

3.2.3.2. *Eschatology in Early Judaism*⁹⁷

Daniel 12 effectively acts as a hinge between the eschatological expectations of the Hebrew Scripture and that of Second Temple Judaism. In it

⁹⁵ Friedman and Overton are right to warn against attempting to find a linear progression from no (or limited) afterlife in the Hebrew Scripture to a full-bodied afterlife in Second Temple Judaism. They specifically point to three resuscitation stories associated with Elijah and Elisha, Isaiah 26, Hos 6:2, and the dry bones of Ezekiel 37 as instances where scholars tend to gloss over evidence for an inchoate resurrection ("Death and the Afterlife," 55–56). They state, "The history of thought rarely moves in a precise linear progression, and those references cannot be completely excluded. At minimum they suggest that the concept was a familiar one in Israel for a long time. The fact that it is so explicitly portrayed in Daniel cannot be taken as indicative of a sea change in Jewish thought of the second century B.C.E." ("Death and the Afterlife," 56). It is worth reiterating that the paucity of information from the Hebrew Scripture indeed creates a problem that is difficult to solve. Nevertheless, within the Hebrew Scripture itself are hints at an afterlife more akin to what finds in Second Temple Judaism, and therefore one should wary of models that posit a steady progression of belief in the afterlife until it reaches full flower in Daniel 12. It is quite likely that there were competing expectations through much of Israel's history.

⁹⁶ Some scholars (e.g. Stordalen, *Echoes of Eden*) suggest that these pastoral settings are intentionally using Edenic motifs to describe the eschatological Israel. As noted above, this reading is not convincing given the fact that the prophetic authors give no clues that they are indeed "echoing" Eden.

⁹⁷ The bibliography for eschatology in Second Temple Judaism is vast. The following is a list of some of the more recent and/or important works. Alan J. Avery-Peck and Jacob

the author writes: "Many of those who sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt. Those who are wise shall shine like the brightness of the sky, and those who lead many to righteousness, like the stars forever and ever" (Dan 12:2–3). The difference between Daniel 12 and the prophetic eschatology of the Hebrew Scripture is stark. For Daniel, both the judgment of the individual and the possibility of life after death are present: some individuals are raised to shame and contempt while others are raised to everlasting life.⁹⁸

Daniel 12, a text almost certainly written in view of the persecution of Jews during the years of Antiochus Epiphanes (2nd c. BCE), serves to show

Neusner, eds., *Death, Life-after-Death, Resurrection and the World-to-Come in the Judaisms of Antiquity* (vol. 4 of *Judaism in Late Antiquity*; Leiden: Brill, 2000); Richard Bauckham, *The Fate of the Dead: Studies on the Jewish and Christian Apocalypses* (NovTSup 93; Leiden: Brill, 1998); idem, "Life, Death, and the Afterlife in Second Temple Judaism," in *Life in the Face of Death: The Resurrection Message of the New Testament* (ed. R. Longenecker; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), 80–95; Hans C. Cavallin, *Life after Death: Paul's Argument for the Resurrection of the Dead in 1 Cor 15: Part I: An Enquiry in to the Jewish Background* (Lund: Gleerup, 1974); idem, "Leben nach dem Tode in Spätjudentum und in frühen Christentum," *ANRW* 19.1:240–345; John J. Collins, "The Afterlife in Apocalyptic Literature," in *Death, Life-after-Death, Resurrection and the World-to-Come in the Judaisms of Antiquity* (ed. A. Avery-Peck and J. Neusner; vol. 4 of *Judaism in Late Antiquity*; Leiden: Brill, 2000), 119–39; Philip R. Davies, "Death, Resurrection, and Life after Death in the Qumran Scrolls," in *Death, Life-after-Death, Resurrection and the World-to-Come in the Judaisms of Antiquity* (ed. A. Avery-Peck and J. Neusner; vol. 4 of *Judaism in Late Antiquity*; Leiden: Brill, 2000), 189–211; Ulrich Fischer, *Eschatologie und Jenseitserwartung im hellenistischen Diasporajudentum* (ZNW 44; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1978); Grabbe, "Eschatology in Philo and Josephus," in *Death, Life-after-Death, Resurrection and the World-to-Come in the Judaisms of Antiquity* (ed. A. Avery-Peck and J. Neusner; vol. 4 of *Judaism in Late Antiquity*; Leiden: Brill, 2000), 163–85; George W. E. Nickelsburg, "Judgment, Life-After-Death, and Resurrection," in *Death, Life-after-Death, Resurrection and the World-to-Come in the Judaisms of Antiquity* (ed. A. Avery-Peck and J. Neusner; vol. 4 of *Judaism in Late Antiquity*; Leiden: Brill, 2000), 141–62; Joseph S. Park, *Conceptions of Afterlife in Jewish Inscriptions: With Special Reference to Pauline Literature* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000); Segal, *Life after Death*, 248–81; Günter Stemberger, *Der Leib der Auferstehung: Studien zur Anthropologie und Eschatologie des palästinischen Judentums in neutestamentlichen Zeitalter* (ca. 170 v. Chr.–100 n. Chr.) (AnBib 56; Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1972); Wright, *Early History of Heaven*, 117–202; Wright, *Resurrection*, 129–206.

⁹⁸ Many scholars assume that Dan 12:3 is an unequivocal reference to bodily resurrection, but the text is much more ambiguous than these scholars suggest (see, e.g., Davies who states, "Unlike Enoch, Daniel speaks of a resurrection of bodies, not reviving of spirits" ["Death, Resurrection, and Life after Death," 195]). Daniel simply says that those who were dead will awake, and the wise will shine like stars. Though the awakening of the dead can be read (and likely was read by many) as a metaphor for bodily resurrection, the author does not specify what kind of bodies the righteous will possess (he does note, however, that the unrighteous will rise too). That he also uses the metaphor of shining like the stars makes it equally, if not more, plausible that Daniel believed in an astral existence in the afterlife. While it would be nice if Daniel gave us more information about the nature of the afterlife body/spirit, as one finds in 2 *Baruch* and 4 *Ezra*, his remark is much terser.

that the possibility of a blessed afterlife, particularly through resurrection, had reached popular status by the middle of the second century. As one might suspect, however, conceptions of the afterlife in Second Temple Judaism were manifold.⁹⁹ Due to the variety of beliefs held by Jews during the Second Temple period, it has become common to speak of *Judaisms* of this age.¹⁰⁰ The issue of the afterlife in Second Temple Judaism is no different.

Outside of the Sadducees, belief in an afterlife had become increasingly popular among Jews living during the Second Temple period. Bauckham notes that Ben Sira,¹⁰¹ which dates to the early second century BCE, “is probably the last Jewish writer of the Second Temple period of whom it can be confidently stated that he did not expect eternal life and judgment after death.”¹⁰² Over the course of the third and second centuries BCE, the expectation of a personal afterlife became increasingly popular among

⁹⁹ Pace Bauckham who states, “Some scholars lay great emphasis on the variety of Jewish beliefs about life after death in Second Temple Judaism. In my view, this emphasis is mistaken. Most of the texts are thoroughly consistent with each other, though not every aspect of the beliefs we have outlined is present in every text” (“Life, Death, and the Afterlife in Second Temple Judaism,” 93). It is possible to address this issue from (at least) two different perspectives—one that attempts to see similarities in the Judaisms of this period and another to see its variety—and Bauckham is clearly doing the former. This project is more interested in the diversity over against the similarity within Judaism that we might see the full panoply of traditions and the nuances that distinguish them.

¹⁰⁰ On the issue of Judaisms in the ancient world, see Boccaccini, *Middle Judaism: Jewish Thought, 300 B.C.E. to 200 C.E.* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1991), 7–25; William Scott Green, “Ancient Judaism, Contours and Complexity,” in *Language, Theology, and the Bible: Essays in Honour of James Barr* (ed. S. E. Balentine and J. Barton; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994), 293–310; Jacob Neusner, “Introduction: The Four Approaches to the Description of Ancient Judaism(s): Nominalist, Harmonistic, Theological, and Historical,” in *Death, Life-after-Death, Resurrection and the World-to-Come in the Judaisms of Antiquity* (ed. A. Avery-Peck and J. Neusner; vol. 4 of *Judaism in Late Antiquity*; Leiden: Brill, 2000), 1–32; Alan F. Segal, *Rebecca's Children: Judaism and Christianity in the Roman World* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1986).

¹⁰¹ For example, the following sentiment about death is representative of Sirach's view, “Whether life lasts for ten years or a hundred or a thousand, there are no questions asked in Hades” (Sir 41:4; cf. 10:10–11; 14:16–19; 17:27–30; 38:21; 41:4; 46:19–20; 49:14). Prior to Sirach, Tobit is a third-century Jewish work that contains a traditionalist view of the afterlife (see 3:6, 10; 4:10; 5:10; 14:10, all of which describe the world beyond death in terms very similar to the Hebrew Scripture even using the term Sheol). Nickelsburg also suggests that Baruch and 1 Maccabees contain a traditional afterlife schema, though this is less clear given both documents' relative silence on the issue (Nickelsburg, “The Apocrypha and the Non-Apocalyptic Pseudepigrapha,” 146–47).

¹⁰² Bauckham, “Life, Death, and the Afterlife in Second Temple Judaism,” 82. Bauckham, of course, rightly qualifies this by saying that there are other writings which do not speak one way or another about the afterlife, but there are no other writings that deny an afterlife or judgment after death. There are writings (such as the Mark 12:18; Matt 22:23; Luke 20:27; Acts 23:8), of course, that make it clear there remained a contingent of Sadducean

Jews, not just in the diaspora but in Palestine as well. A reward and punishment system that operates entirely on this side of death became increasingly problematic for Jews, and a watershed moment appears to have happened at some point during the Maccabean period when Jews faced intense persecution and forced Hellenization.¹⁰³ In 2 Maccabees, for example, not only are the righteous killed by Antiochus Epiphanes and his army, but the righteous are sought out, and thus righteousness during this period of persecution does not lead to reward—i.e. the traditional perspective—but punishment.¹⁰⁴ It is after this point in Jewish history that the balance is tipped in favor of a personal afterlife, and the entirety of the extant early Jewish texts from this point forward favor a reward and punishment system located in the afterlife.

In order to introduce the primary literature from on which the rest of this chapter draws, and given this study's interest in the topography or the location of utopia, the following discussion of eschatological utopianism will use the *location* of the eschaton as an organizing principle for the expectations of utopian topoi. Below are four classifications for the location of the eschatological utopia: 1. Jerusalem/Israel; 2. The ends of the earth; 3. The heavens; 4. An unspecified location.

1. Jerusalem/Israel. Within this category one can fit the eschatological traditions from the Hebrew Scriptures. As noted above, the eschaton within the Hebrew Scriptures was primarily focused on the reconstitution of the people and place of Israel. This tradition continues into the Second Temple literature. Baruch, for example, cries out to the people of Jerusalem in a manner reminiscent of the prophets. The final, eschatological portion of Baruch begins with the statement, "Take courage, O Jerusalem, for the one who named you will comfort you" (4:30). Following this

Jews who did not believe in an afterlife as late as the first century, but Sirach is the last extant text written by such a person.

¹⁰³ This is not to say, however, that the persecution of the second century BCE led to a belief in the afterlife since 1 *Enoch* already exhibits such a belief and was written prior to this time. It is most likely that belief in a personal afterlife with punishment and reward grew alongside competing views over a long period of time, much of it during the third century BCE, a period of time about which modern scholars know remarkably little. It is not until the intense persecution of the second century BCE, however, that a belief in the afterlife became the dominant position (see Friedman and Overton, "Death and the Afterlife," 55–56).

¹⁰⁴ The most accessible examples being Eleazar, the martyr in 2 Maccabees 6, and the seven brothers in 2 Maccabees 7. For insightful commentary on the critical texts from this period, see Nickelsburg, *Resurrection, Immortality, and Eternal Life in Intertestamental Judaism and Early Christianity* (exp. ed.; HTS 56; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2006), 23–140; cf. Collins, "The Afterlife in Apocalyptic Literature," 127.

exclamation, the author speaks directly to Jerusalem throughout and uses the phrase “O Jerusalem” three other times. As with the Hebrew Scripture, the concern is not individual judgment and blessing, it is the reconstitution of Jerusalem and her people.

The *Book of Watchers* is an important text in which Jerusalem is the eschatological resting place. *1 Enoch* contains what is often read as two depictions of different Edenic utopias (24–25; 32),¹⁰⁵ and yet neither of these places is the place of the eschaton. Instead, following the cues of Ezekiel 47, *1 En.* 25.5 explains that the tree that presently sits in heaven with God will be “transplanted to the holy place, by the house of God, the King of eternity.”¹⁰⁶ At this time, the residents of Jerusalem will live long lives free of torments, plagues, and suffering. That the eschaton is earthly is corroborated by the utopian description from *1 En.* 10.16–22 which states that “all the earth will be tilled in righteousness, and all of it will be planted with trees and filled with blessing” (10.18). The idea here is a renewal of the earth, not an escape to the ends of the earth or to a heavenly paradise.

The author of *Jubilees* expects a renewal of the heaven and the earth, perhaps similar to the *Book of Watchers*, in which “the sanctuary of the Lord is created in Jerusalem upon Mount Zion” (1.29). Jerusalem is here the center of the focus of the earth’s renewal. Later in 23.22–31, the author of *Jubilees* describes a more traditional eschatological picture that focuses not on the judgment of individuals but of the nation; however, this description does not intimate the importance of Jerusalem though it clearly conceives of a this-worldly eschaton.¹⁰⁷

The *Testament of Dan* and the *Psalms of Solomon* both envision an eschaton that is ushered in by a messianic figure. In both works, it is the Messiah who wages war against the forces of evil ultimately purging the land (*T. Dan.* 5.10–12; *Pss. Sol.* 17.30; cf. 11.1–7). Both works speak directly of Jerusalem as the place where the eschatological utopia is established,

¹⁰⁵ However, see above for problems with 24–25 as Eden.

¹⁰⁶ This translation and all others of *1 Enoch* come from Nickelsburg and VanderKam.

Interestingly, Collins uses *1 En.* 24–25 as an example of a heavenly paradise that Jews would have longed to enter. It is not clear that the author ever expected anyone to enter this paradise in the same way no one would again enter the paradise of *1 En.* 32. Instead, the expectation is that Jerusalem would be the final resting place for the righteous. See Collins, “Models of Utopia,” 65.

¹⁰⁷ The two descriptions—1.29 which expects a new heavens and new earth, and 23.22–31 which describes a gradual movement into a utopian life—seem at odds with one another. The first suggests radical change, more consonant with an apocalyptic eschatology, while the latter suggest gradual improvement, more consonant with a prophetic eschatology.

and the *Testament of Dan* uses the language of “new Jerusalem” setting it in direct parallel to Eden (5.12)—similar to the Edenic new Jerusalem in the book of Revelation.¹⁰⁸

Finally, the tradition that Jerusalem is located at the navel of the world is one that dates at least as far back as the Table of Nations in Genesis 10 but can also be found in Second Temple literature in works such as *Jubilees* (see 8.12).¹⁰⁹ Concomitant with this tradition is the idea that, in the eschaton, Jerusalem again will be established as the center of the world, a tradition present in Ezek 38:12 and one that shares similarities with the expectation of a eschatological pilgrimage of the nations (a universal *Völkerwallfahrt*).¹¹⁰ This tradition suggests that Jerusalem will not only be the geographical center but also the center of commerce, trade, and social norms.

2. The Ends of the Earth. As part of the Jewish tradition, some authors envisioned a terrestrial paradise (as a opposed to a heavenly paradise which is also present in the literature) as the eschatological utopia, but rather than placing this utopia within the boundaries of Israel and Jerusalem, they placed it in a remote location. The origins of such tradition are certainly connected to Edenic traditions in which Eden is located at the far-reaches of the earth. Here the *Urzeit-Endzeit* motif appears with clarity since all of the examples from this section are references to the paradise of Eden that the righteous either presently inhabit upon death or will someday inhabit at the eschaton.¹¹¹

¹⁰⁸ James L. Kugel (*Traditions of the Bible: A Guide to the Bible As It Was at the Start of the Common Era* [Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1998], 106) and Beavis (*Jesus and Utopia*, 118, n. 17) suggest that the *Testament of Dan* does not have a specific place in mind when it references Eden. However, the context of the reference gives more information than they recognize. The mention of the new Jerusalem in parallel with Eden in 10.12 along with another reference to Jerusalem in 10.13 is enough to suggest that a renewed, earthly Jerusalem is in view.

¹⁰⁹ For traditions of Jerusalem in the Hebrew Scriptures and Second Temple Judaism, see Mikeal C. Parsons, *Luke: Storyteller, Interpreter, Evangelist* (Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 2007), 91–93.

¹¹⁰ For more on the *Völkerwallfahrt* tradition, see below under *topos* “Citizens: Inhabitants” and in chapter four under the *topos* “Wealth.” For examples of this tradition, see 1 Kgs 10.23–25; Pss 22:27–29; 47:7–9; 86:9; 68:29; 72:9–11; 102:21–22; 122:3–4; 138:4–5; Isa 2:1–4; 11:10–12; 18:7; 49:22–23; 56:5–8; 60:3–17; 61:5–6; 66:12, 18, 23; Jer 3:17; Hag 2:6–9; Mic 4:1–2; Zeph 3:10; Zech 8:20–23; 14:16–17; Tob 13:11; 2 Macc. 5.16; Josephus, *J.W.* 5.187; *Ant.* 15.402; *Sib. Or.* 3.710–731, 772–773; *T. Ben.* 9.2; *Pss. Sol.* 17.30–35.

¹¹¹ Not all references to people inhabiting paradise are meant to suggest that all righteous people will inhabit it. For example, *Jubilees* gives an account of paradise in which Enoch is present, judging the people of the earth, but there is no stated expectation that others will join him there (*Jub.* 4.21–26).

The earthly garden of Eden as the eschatological utopia is an idea found in the *Parables of Enoch* (1 *Enoch* 37–71). According to the *Parables*, the garden is the place where the righteous live immediately upon death (1 *En.* 60.8; 61.12; 70.4). That this paradise is located on earth is made clear in 60.8, which mentions its eastern location, and in 70.4, which is followed by a statement that, after viewing this place, Enoch's spirit "ascended to heaven," suggesting it was not in heaven in the verse prior. Furthermore, the *Parables* end with a description of the heavenly realm that contains God and thousands of angels but is devoid of any human beings. For these reasons, it is most likely that the eschaton of the *Parables of Enoch* is an earthly eschaton. And yet, the eschatology of the *Parables of Enoch* is not entirely consistent.¹¹² *First Enoch* 62.13–16 describes a resurrection that does not appear to take place in Eden. Further, the eschatological utopian descriptions of 1 *En.* 52.1–9 and 58.1–6 say nothing of paradise but are more aligned with a general resurrection that will take place throughout the world. It is possible that the author conceives of the eschaton as a two-stage process. The first stage is an immediate transfer to paradise at the ends of the earth upon death. The second stage is a resurrection from the dead and an inhabiting of the world (1 *En.* 45.4–5). Such an expectation is found in other Jewish texts (e.g. 4 *Ezra*). Nevertheless, the *Parables of Enoch* is not clear on this point and its ambiguity leaves open a few possible readings.

The *Apocalypse of Abraham* has one of the clearest examples of Eden as both *Urzeit* and *Endzeit*.¹¹³ In chapters 21–23, Abraham is taken into

¹¹² Nickelsburg and VanderKam write: "The evidence regarding the place of blessing for the righteous and chosen [in the *Parables*] is more complex," and on the following page, "To summarize, part of the evidence in the *Parables* is clear, some of it is ambiguous, and not all of it provides a coherent teaching about the future of the righteous and chosen" (1 *Enoch* 2, 51; 52). Cf. Nickelsburg, "Where is the Place of Eschatological Blessing?" in *Things Revealed: Studies in Early Jewish and Christian Literature in Honor of Michael E. Stone* (JSJSup 89; ed. E. Chazon, D. Satran, and R. Clements; Leiden: Brill, 2004), 60–63.

The *Lives of Adam and Eve* has an equally conflated account of the eschaton, though this is quite likely due to the heavy redaction that took place over many centuries. On the one hand, the document contains passages that seem to indicate a resurrection into the garden of Eden. For example, when Adam is removed from the garden, God says that in the time of the resurrection he will be given from the tree of life (*G.L.A.E.* 28.4; cf. 13.1–5; 41.3). Furthermore, the garden is described repeatedly as an earthly place, the entrance of which Adam, Eve, and their children are able to approach. However, other references indicate that upon Adam's death, his soul was transferred into the heavens suggesting a heavenly (*G.L.A.E.* 13.6; 43.3). Similarly, in the *Vita*, paradise is both heavenly (25.3) and earthly (40.1). Given its redactional history, there is no need to explain away these differences.

¹¹³ A date for the *Apocalypse of Abraham* is hard to pin down. It must certainly have been written after 70 CE (given the destruction of Jerusalem in ch. 27) and most scholars

the heavens by an angel and is told to look below him at the earth. When he looks down he sees a vision of Eden with two distinct tellings of the same location. First, he sees an eschatological Eden filled with a great crowd of people split into two camps. He is told that those on the left are prepared for judgment while those on the right are prepared to be called the people of God. In the second scene, Abraham is looking at the same place, but this time he sees Adam, Eve, and the serpent and describes the temptation and fall that occurred in the primeval Eden. For the author of the *Apocalypse of Abraham*, then, there is no difference between the eschatological Eden and the original paradise of God, and both are clearly on this earth.¹¹⁴

3. The Heavens. In his study on utopianism and the biblical tradition, Collins sifts through some of the literature from the Hebrew Scripture and early Judaism in order to determine whether the Jewish eschatological tradition longs for a “locative” or a “utopian” (no place) eschaton¹¹⁵—i.e. whether Jerusalem and Israel are central to the eschatological vision or not. He concludes:

To speak . . . of a yearning for the country of eternal Spring is only partially correct, since it misses the most distinctive aspect of the tradition. The yearning is not for the isles of the blessed, somewhere beyond the ocean, nor, with few exceptions, for a return to the garden of Eden. Rather, it is the yearning for a very specific place, hallowed by ancestral associations that may be partly legendary but in part all too well documented.¹¹⁶

While Collins’ study has much to commend, and he is indeed right that the land is a “distinctive aspect of the tradition,” he does not give enough credit to the Jewish traditions that envision a heavenly afterlife, and in the statement quoted above he certainly underestimates the importance of the Edenic afterlife. A number of examples of the latter have been noted above, and what follows is a list of texts that represent a larger body of literature than Collins has accounted for.¹¹⁷

situate it somewhere in the second century (Rubinkiewicz, “Apocalypse of Abraham,” in *OTP* 1:683).

¹¹⁴ See also *Apoc. Ab.* 29.11–13.

¹¹⁵ Here using the terms as defined by Smith, *Map is Not Territory*, 101. See the introduction above.

¹¹⁶ Collins, “Models of Utopia,” 67.

¹¹⁷ In Collins’ discussion of the “heavenly paradise,” he gives examples from texts: 1 *Enoch* 24–25; 2 *Enoch* 8; 3 *Baruch* 4; 2 *Baruch*; 4 *Ezra*; and two texts from the New Testament (2 Corinthians 11; Revelation 21–22). He spends little to no time on each passage only citing from 1 *Enoch* 24–25, which is odd considering this passage is not a vision of

Fourth Ezra contains a few passages that explicitly mention “paradise” (4.7–8; 7.36, 123; 8.25), a term that the author uses as a reference to the eschatological Eden, a place of reward for the righteous. For example, in his conversation with the angel Uriel, Ezra is repeatedly worried about the fate of the unrighteous and considers himself counted among the damned. In response, the angel tells Ezra to stop asking about those who will perish (8.55) and to instead, “think of your own case, and inquire concerning the glory of those who are like yourself, because it is for you that Paradise is opened, the tree of life is planted, the age to come is prepared, plenty is provided, a city is built, rest is appointed, goodness is established and wisdom perfected beforehand” (8.51–52). A reference to Eden is unmistakable given the mention of the “tree of life” and the use of the word “paradise.” For Ezra, however, paradise is not located in the earthly realm but in heaven, a fact clarified in 4.7–8 where Ezra, in Job-like fashion, is asked a series of questions about his knowledge of the foundations of the world.¹¹⁸ Ezra’s angelic examiner concludes the series of questions by asking for the location of the “exits of hell” and the “entrances of Paradise.” Ezra’s answer is, “I never went down into the deep, nor as yet into hell, neither did I ever ascend into heaven.” For the author of *4 Ezra*, the exits of hell are “in the deep” while the entrances of paradise—the eschatological garden of Eden—requires one to ascend to heaven. Thus, for *4 Ezra* Eden is not an earthly locale but a heavenly one.¹¹⁹

a heavenly paradise for the righteous despite being an eschatological paradise. As stated elsewhere, *1 En.* 25.5 clearly places the eschaton in Jerusalem.

¹¹⁸ See Michael Stone, “Paradise in *4 Ezra* iv.8 and vii.36, viii.52,” *JJS* 17 (1966): 85–88.

¹¹⁹ It is worth noting that *4 Ezra*, a document written 250–350 years after Daniel and the Enochic *Book of Watchers*, shows significant evidence of evolution and elaboration on the topic of life after death. The author, therefore, says more and says it more precisely than the authors of Daniel and *1 Enoch*. For example, *4 Ezra* shows concern for what life is like in the intermediate state between death and judgment (7.88–101), whether or not one can pray for the dead (7.102–105), and the question of God’s love and justice in light of just how many people will face eternal death (7.106–131). The author asks penetrating questions about the transitions from life to death and back to life, questions that show deep reflection about the nature of humanity and how *anyone* is saved. He states, “For in truth there is no one among those who have been born who has not acted wickedly, and among those who have existed there is no one who has not transgressed. For in this, O Lord, your righteousness and goodness will be declared, when you are merciful to those who have no store of good works” (*4 Ezra* 8.35–36). Here the author connects his anthropology (all are sinful) with a doctrine about God (the Lord is righteous) in order to reflect on why it is that so few people make it to the “Paradise of delight” (7.36). It is possible one may wish to argue that *4 Ezra* is either more interested in this subject than Daniel or *1 Enoch*, or perhaps he is a more insightful thinker, but more likely is that he has the benefit of centuries of thought on which to stand. While Daniel and *1 Enoch* stand near the beginning

In 2 *Baruch* one finds a two-stage eschatological scenario. Chapters 29–30 are a description of the earth during the Messiah's arrival and the beginning of the resurrection. While this first stage is earthly, after the resurrection happens, 2 *Baruch* describes a situation in which people will be transformed into beings like angels, they will be "equal to the stars," and "the extent of Paradise will be spread out for them" (2 *Bar.* 48.48–51.16). Particularly the statement regarding paradise, a place said to be preserved in heaven with God (4.2–6), indicates that the author has in mind a heavenly dwelling place for the righteous.

The astral imagery used in 2 *Baruch* 51 (angels and stars) is found elsewhere as a hope for the righteous, notably in 1 *Enoch* 104.2–6. Here the author is comforting the auditors by pointing to a future in which the righteous will "shine like the luminaries of heaven" (104.2). A few lines later in v. 6 the author explains that they will "be companions of the host of heaven." The use of astral language to describe the future situation of the blessed can also be found in Daniel 12, which speaks of resurrection and combines it with astral language. Daniel's statement, which sits at the fountainhead of early Jewish reflections on the afterlife, contributed to a stream of Jewish tradition that conceived of the afterlife in astral terms (see 1 *En.* 43.1–4; 104.2, 6; 4 *Ezra* 7.97; 2 *Bar.* 51.5, 10; 85.10–15; *T. Mos.* 10.8–10).

The writing of 2 *Enoch* is another example of a heavenly afterlife that combines paradise and the eschatological utopia for the righteous. *Second Enoch* 8.1–9.1 and 42.3–14 contain lengthy descriptions of this utopia located in the heavens. Similarly, the *Testament of Abraham* describes a scene in the heavens in which Abraham is watching souls enter one of two gates, a wide gate that leads to perdition and a narrow gate that leads to paradise (*T. Ab.* [A] 11.1–10). For the author of the *Testament of Abraham*, paradise, or the eschatological Eden, is located in the heavenly realm. This is confirmed at the end of work when the character Death finally deceives Abraham and takes his soul from his body and transfers it to paradise where the righteous live together in bliss (20.14).¹²⁰

Finally, Pseudo-Philo's *Biblical Antiquities* knows of both a primeval and an eschatological paradise, as mentioned above (*L.A.B.* 11.15; 19.10–12; 25.11–26.15; 32.8; see *Edenic Utopianism*). And while Pseudo-Philo is not

of Jewish reflection on a personal afterlife, 4 *Ezra* (among many other works) stands on the shoulders of the many who have gone before.

¹²⁰ *G.L.A.E.* too knows of the transfer of the soul to the heavenlies, only here with regard to Adam instead of Abraham (13.6; 43.3; cf. *Vita* 25.3). In *G.L.A.E.* 37.5 and 40.1 paradise is explicitly said to be in the third heaven.

altogether clear about the final resting place of Eden, at present paradise sits in heaven being preserved from the corruptions of the world, similar to 2 *Bar.* 4.3–6. For this reason, and given that the author nowhere mentions a change in the location of paradise, it is most likely that the eschatological paradise where the righteous will dwell is a heavenly one.

Returning to Collins' statement that Jewish longing for an eschaton located in the garden of Eden or somewhere beyond the ocean is an exception to the rule seems to be an overstatement.¹²¹ Without denying his conclusion that Jerusalem and the land of Israel play a vital role in the eschatological imagination of Jews throughout the biblical and early Jewish period, it appears he has emphasized the "locative" nature of some strands of Judaism at the expense of the "utopian" or heavenly-minded traditions. Ancient Judaism has a considerable amount of both.

4. An Unspecified Location.¹²² In this last section, a few more texts need to be mentioned that describe eschatological utopias but do so without indicating where that utopia is located. Most notably the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* contain a few important descriptions of the eschaton. Thus, *T. Levi* 18.1–4, *T. Jud* 25.1–5, and *T. Ben.* 10.6–9 all contain important eschatological descriptions that lack a reference to location. The *Testament of Levi* notes that in the last days the "gates of paradise" will once again be opened, and the sword of the cherubim will be removed so that the righteous can eat of the tree of life (18.10–11).¹²³ The location of this paradise, however (whether earthly or heavenly), is unannounced. With respect to the *Testament of Judah* and the *Testament of Benjamin*, both texts contain references to resurrection, but one should not immediately assume this is a bodily resurrection. Along with 4 *Ezra*, 2 *Baruch*, Daniel, and *G.L.A.E.*—all texts that contain resurrection and a heavenly afterlife—the authors of the *Testament of Judah* and the *Testament of Benjamin* could have a heavenly destination in mind.

In conclusion, the location of the eschatological utopia has a wide range of options stretching from the plot of land promised to Abraham to the ends of the earth where one finds the paradise of God to the heavens and beyond where God and the holy angels dwell with the righteous.

¹²¹ Collins, "Models of Utopia," 67.

¹²² It is possible that, besides the texts that follow, 1 *En.* 102.4–103.4 belongs here as well given the little information it provides regarding the location of the blessed life. However, because this passage is immediately followed by the astral/heavenly language found in 104.2–6 (see above), it is plausible that a heavenly location is what is in view.

¹²³ Kugel also categorizes this text as unspecified (*Traditions of the Bible*, 106; cf. Beavis, *Jesus and Utopia*, 118, n. 17).

The often-suggested dichotomy between Jewish resurrection of the body and Hellenistic immortality of the soul—as if Jews only believed in a bodily afterlife and Greeks believed in a spiritual afterlife—does not do justice to the variety in the early Jewish views of the afterlife.¹²⁴ Clearly a fuller description of early Jewish views on the afterlife requires more nuance.

3.3. THE *TOPOI* OF JEWISH UTOPIAS

The second half of this chapter will utilize the same *topoi* explored in the Greco-Roman chapter. Despite the many differences in the ways they are developed and understood, the list of *topoi* works well for both cultures. The categories necessary to construct a utopia are likely similar in all cultures; what is interesting is how each culture fills in the data.

As with the previous chapter, the content of the *topoi* below unavoidably overlap at times. In an attempt to mitigate unnecessary repetition, the reader will be pointed to the *topos* within which a larger discussion of an issue occurs rather than repeating it.

3.3.1. *Setting*

As with the Greco-Roman discussion about the setting of utopia, there are two primary options: rural and urban. The ancient Jewish literature necessarily holds these two settings in tension. The reason for this is somewhat obvious: there are at its core two fountainheads for the traditions of utopia: traditions about Eden and traditions about Jerusalem. Eden as a form of utopia is clearly rural and sets a trajectory in that direction such that the *Endzeit* is like the *Urzeit*. Both Edenic and eschatological utopias, then, are often set in a rural location.

But in the Jewish worldview, the land of Israel, and particularly the city of Jerusalem and its temple, play an irreplaceable role and are representative of God's promise to the people of Israel. City life, therefore, is an inextricable part of Israel's DNA and a part of their expectation for a rightly ordered world. Because Israel's history contains both rural and urban utopian settings, ancient authors sometimes favor one tradition to

¹²⁴ Collins rightly critiques Cullmann on this point. See Collins, "The Afterlife in Apocalyptic Literature," 129; cf. Cullmann, "Immortality of the Soul or Resurrection of the Dead?" in *Immortality and Resurrection* (ed. K. Stendahl; New York: MacMillan, 1971), 9–35.

the neglect of the other, while others combine the two by putting urban and rural side-by-side.

Edenic utopias are quite naturally rural in nature—Genesis 2–3 describes a garden with rivers, trees, animals, etc. Ezekiel’s vision of the eschaton envisions a land that is restored and “has become like the garden of Eden” (Ezek 36:35). What is less intuitive is the way certain authors employ the Edenic utopia combining it with or alluding to a more urban environment. *Jubilees*, for example, places the garden in concert with the temple noting that both are holy sites (2.7; 3.12, 27; 8.19).¹²⁵ Or sometimes authors take urban images of Jerusalem and rural-ize them. Returning again to Ezekiel, this is indeed what one finds in his eschatological vision. Here Jerusalem’s temple becomes the font of a river, a river that brings life everywhere it goes, on the banks of which are trees that grow year round and bring healing (Ezekiel 47; cf. Isa 41:18; 43:19).¹²⁶ Or sometimes an author might set the two side-by-side without explaining how the urban and rural fit together (*T. Dan* 5.12).

Philo too combines the imagery of the urban and the rural in his description of the Therapeutai, a utopian sect that has the benefits offered by city living, i.e. companionship, mixed with the greater benefits of living in nature.¹²⁷ Their location is said to be above the Mareotic Lake (perhaps overlooking it) in a secure area with temperate climate (*Contempl.* 23). Philo then writes, “They are neither near together as in towns, since living at close quarters is troublesome and displeasing to people who are seeking to satisfy their desire for solitude, nor yet at a great distance because of the sense of fellowship which they cherish, and to render help to each other if robbers attack them” (*Contempl.* 24 [Colson, LCL]).

¹²⁵ For more on the connection between Eden and the temple in *Jubilees*, see above under *Edenic Utopianism*. See also Lanfer, “Allusion to and Expansion of the Tree of Life,” 98–99; Ruiten, “Eden and Temple” (esp. 75–79); idem, “Visions of the Temple in the Book of *Jubilees*,” 215–27; Brooke, “Miqdash Adam, Eden, and the Qumran Community”; Joseph M. Baumgarten, “4Q500 and the Ancient Conception of the Lord’s Vineyard,” *JJS* 40 (1989):1–6; Stordalen, *Echoes of Eden*, 307–310.

¹²⁶ For other examples of rivers flowing from Jerusalem see below under the *topos* “Rivers/Water.”

¹²⁷ Philo’s preference for the rural life is less clear here, but elsewhere notes that those who are wise avoid cities and live lives of peace (*Spec.* 2.42–48; cf. Taylor and Davies, “The So-Called Therapeutai,” 7–8). For example, he applauds the Essenes for avoiding cities (*Prob.* 76; however, cp. *Hypoth.* 11.1). Interestingly, Philo’s statement that the Essenes avoid cities stands in direct contrast to Josephus’ description of the Essenes who he says live in “every city” (*J.W.* 2.124).

The overlapping nature of the three themes—Israel, Eden, and eschaton—is displayed well in the following passage from 2 *Baruch*. The author is lamenting the destruction of Jerusalem, but God's response is that the true Jerusalem is laid up in the heavens with Paradise. The Lord says to Baruch,

Do you think this is the city of which I said: *On the palms of my hands I have carved you?* It is not this building [the temple] that is in your midst now; it is that which will be revealed, with me, that was already prepared from the moment that I decided to create Paradise. And I showed it to Adam before he sinned. But when he transgressed the commandment, it was taken away from him—as also Paradise.... Behold, now it is preserved with me—as also Paradise. (2 *Bar.* 4.2–3, 6)¹²⁸

Throughout 2 *Baruch*, in response to Baruch's despair over the fall of Jerusalem and the temple, God repeatedly points to a future afterlife as a time when the true Jerusalem will be revealed and the righteous will dwell in it. The language to describe this afterlife includes both urban language as well as paradisiac.

The setting of the Jewish utopia, then, often contains both rural and urban elements rooted in the larger traditions and interests in Eden and Jerusalem.

3.3.2. *Wealth*

Scholarly interest in the topic of wealth in the ancient world is extensive.¹²⁹ Capturing ancient Jewish expectations about wealth requires some nuance. Occasionally wealth is perceived and depicted as an evil *per se*.

¹²⁸ See also 2 *Bar.* 59.4–12.

¹²⁹ See, in particular, Robert Royalty, jr., *The Streets of Heaven: The Ideology of Wealth in the Apocalypse of John* (Macon, Ga.: Mercer University Press, 1998); Mark Mathews, "Riches, Poverty, and the Faithful: Perspectives on Wealth in the Second Temple Period and the Apocalypse of John," (Ph.D. diss., Durham University, 2010). See also, Martin Hengel, *Property and Riches in the Early Church* (tr. J. Bowden; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1974); Craig Blomberg, *Neither Poverty nor Riches: A Biblical Theology of Material Possessions* (New Studies in Biblical Theology 7; Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity Press, 1999); Leslie J. Hoppe, *There Shall Be No Poor Among You: Poverty in the Bible* (Nashville: Abingdon Press 2004); Ulrich Berges and Rudolph Hoppe, *Arm und Reich* (NEchtB 10; Würzburg: Echter, 2009). To this list could be added a number of studies on wealth in specific biblical books; for an annotated list, see Mathews, "Riches, Poverty, and the Faithful," 6 (to his bibliography should be added Bruce Longenecker and Kelly Liebengood, eds., *Engaging Economics: New Testament Scenarios and Early Christian Reception* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009]; Bruce Longenecker, *Remember the Poor: Paul, Poverty, and the Greco-Roman World* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010]).

More often, however, it is not wealth itself that is evil but its abuse or misuse. Related to both of these is what is often called the “great reversal,” an eschatological hope that those who have little in this life will have much in the next and *vice versa*. Finally, wealth was not always perceived negatively and in fact could be used in very positive ways. This is especially true with regard to depictions of the throne of God. Each of these subjects will be addressed here.

3.3.2.1. *Wealth as Evil*

The belief that wealth is inherently evil can be found with moderate ease in Jewish literature. In Isaiah, for example, the prophet rails against Israel for consorting with diviners and soothsayers, bowing to idols, and filling the land with horses and chariots, presumably for war (Isa 2:6–8). In the midst of this, Isaiah notes that the “land is filled with silver and gold, and there is no end to their treasures,” a phrase that in certain contexts could be read as a positive portrayal of wealth, but in the midst of this indictment, is used as one more indictment against Israel.

In *1 En.* 7:1–8:4, the Watchers, a group of fallen angels from a tradition connected to Genesis 6, are blamed for introducing a number of nefarious things into the world:

[The angel Asael] showed them metals of the earth and how they should work gold to fashion it suitably, and concerning silver, to fashion it for bracelets and ornaments for women. And he showed them concerning antimony and eye paint and all manner of precious stones and dyes. And the sons of men made them for themselves and for their daughters, and they transgressed and led the holy ones astray. (*1 En.* 8:1)

Gold, silver, and precious stones are here objects that lead the righteous astray. That wealth is given a negative spin is seen also in *1 Enoch* 14, a description of the throne room of God. One might expect a description of a throne room to contain all manner of precious metals and jewels, as one finds in the vivid description of Solomon’s temple and palace in *1 Kgs* 5:1–8:66 (*2 Chr* 3:1–7:22). Instead, Enoch’s description, quite vivid in itself, upends this expectation. In fact, *1 Enoch* 14 contains no mention at all of any precious materials.¹³⁰ In place of wealth language, the author’s description focuses on images from nature such as fire, ice, snow, hail, stars, and water; even the throne itself is described as in the appearance

¹³⁰ Note that Isaac’s translation of the Ethiopic in the *OTP* contains marble walls and crystal floors.

of ice with wheels like the shining sun (cp. 1 Kgs 10:18; 2 Chr 9:17–18). It appears that the author has here intentionally avoided the language of wealth in describing God's throne room.

And yet the *Book of Watchers* is not completely without positive regard for precious metals and jewels.¹³¹ While touring the cosmos, Enoch gives a second description of God's throne, this time seated on a mountain range. This throne, however, is not described with language from nature, as in ch. 14, but with precious jewels.

I came and saw a place that was burning night and day, where (there were) seven mountains of precious stones—three lying to the east and three to the south. And of those to the east, (one was) of colored stone, and one was of pearl, and one was of <jasper>. And those to the south were of flame-colored stone. And the middle one of them reached to heaven like the throne of God—of antimony; and the top of the throne was of lapis lazuli. (1 En. 18.6–8)

Ironically, Enoch's earlier description of God's throne located in a heavenly abode appeals to images from nature. But when he is describing nature, i.e. a mountain that "reached to heaven like the throne of God," he resorts to wealth imagery.¹³² Within the *Book of Watchers*, then, one finds competing images regarding the proper understanding and display of wealth.¹³³

Despite the positive mention of wealth in 1 *Enoch* 18, the larger corpus of 1 *Enoch* appears to counter this by reimagining this mountain range in ch. 52. In what is likely a rewriting and reinterpretation of 1 *Enoch* 18, the *Similitudes of Enoch* (1 *Enoch* 37–71, a text certainly written after the *Book of Watchers*) describes a similar mountain vision in which Enoch is taken up and transported to a western location where he sees a series of mountains made of various precious metals: iron, copper, silver, gold, soft metal, and lead. The angel who is with him explains that once the Elect One has come, each of these mountains will become "like wax before the fire, and like the water that comes down from above upon these mountains, and

¹³¹ It should be noted that conflicting ideology within the *Book of Watchers* (1 En. 1–36) should not be entirely surprising given its composite nature. For example, Nickelsburg, in his commentary on 1 *Enoch*, finds at least five layers of redaction in the first thirty-six chapters of 1 *Enoch*.

¹³² It is worth noting that 1 *Enoch* 24–25 describes an Edenic paradise also cast as a mountain range containing "stones [that] were precious in beauty" (24.2). The qualifier, "in beauty," suggests that "precious" is meant to convey beauty not wealth. Furthermore, in the description of the mountain range in chs. 24–25, the author mentions no specific gems or jewels as one finds in ch. 18.

¹³³ For more examples of positive use of wealth see below.

they will be weak before [the Chosen One's] feet" (1 *En.* 52.6). The angel then interprets the scene: "In those days none will save himself either by gold or silver, and none will be able to flee. . . . All these [substances] will be wiped out and perish from the face of the earth when the Chosen One appears before the Lord of Spirits" (52.7, 9).

Robert Royalty suggests that this passage "reinterprets the mountains of jewels that Enoch is depicted as seeing in 1 *Enoch* 18, challenging the ideology in the *Book of Watchers* by reversing the association of God and wealth."¹³⁴ Indeed, the *Similitudes* do reinterpret ch. 18, but the significance of this is more profound than Royalty suggests. By focusing its attention on reinterpreting the positive portrayal of wealth in ch. 18, the *Similitudes* have effectively reinterpreted the *only* positive mention of wealth in the entire Enochic corpus, thereby removing any ambiguity that might exist regarding the deleterious effects of wealth. The passage not only states that one's wealth is incapable of saving a person, but in the end all objects of wealth will be wiped from the earth.¹³⁵ That wealth needs to be wiped from the earth displays just how pernicious it is.

The authors of book 2 of the *Sibylline Oracles* and Pseudo-Phocylides also take part in the tradition that wealth is inherently evil. The following statement from *Sib. Or.* 2.109–118 (a passage that cites, word-for-word, parts of Ps.-Phoc. 42–47) begins with what seems to be a nuanced understanding of wealth—the problem being unjust gains or love of money—but quickly turns to demonizing wealth *per se*.

(Neither wish to be wealthy nor pray for it. But pray for this: to live on a little, having nothing unjust.) The love of money is the mother of all evil. (Have no desire for gold or silver. Also in these there will be double-edged iron which destroys the spirit.) Gold and silver are always a deception for men. Life-destroying gold, originator of evils, crushing all things, would that you were not a desired affliction for men, for because of you are battles, plunderings, murders, children hostile to their parents and brothers to their kindred. (*Sib. Or.* 2.109–118)¹³⁶

The sentiment clearly states that wealth does not just have the potential for ruin, it is "always a deception for men," "life-destroying," the "originator

¹³⁴ Royalty, *Streets of Heaven*, 56.

¹³⁵ Perhaps it is this sentiment that stands behind the strange remark from the *Testament of Dan* that in the new Jerusalem, "the Holy One of Israel will rule over them in humility and poverty" (5.13). Unfortunately there is very little context for this statement, and it is quite difficult to discern why the author would suggest this.

¹³⁶ The only portions of this citation not taken directly from Ps.-Phoc. 42–47 are those in parentheses.

of evils,” and the cause of all sorts of chaos including war. Given the nature and location of writing of the *Sibylline Oracles* in what is clearly a Hellenistic format, it is not surprising that there are some strong similarities between its understanding of wealth as leading to war and that of certain Greco-Roman authors as seen in the previous chapter.¹³⁷

3.3.2.2. *Wealth Abused*

Most often one finds wealth viewed as a means to evil rather than inherently evil. This is perhaps a fine line to draw, and one that ancient authors do not always recognize, but it is nevertheless a worthwhile distinction for creating a spectrum of attitudes toward wealth rather than a monochromatic picture.

The topic of wealth finds a primary role in the *Epistle of Enoch*, the fifth book of *1 Enoch* (91–107). If the *Book of Watchers* showed signs of ambivalence toward wealth (an ambivalence tempered by the *Similitudes*), the *Epistle of Enoch* shows repeated contempt for those who abuse wealth. In a series of woes, the sinful rich are singled out as particularly damnable.

Woe to those who build their houses with sin;
for from all their foundations they will be overthrown,
and by the sword they will fall.
And those who acquire gold and silver in judgment will quickly perish.
Woe to you, rich, for in your riches you have trusted;
from your riches you will depart,
because you have not remembered the Most High in the days of your riches.
You have committed blasphemy and iniquity;
and you have been prepared for the day of bloodshed
and the day of darkness and the day of great judgment. (*1 En.* 94.7–9)¹³⁸

Wealth is here not described as evil in and of itself (though one does not find any examples of positive uses of wealth); instead, what brings condemnation is putting one's trust in riches rather than God.¹³⁹ It is this posture toward wealth that the psalmist warns against: “See the one who would

¹³⁷ For wealth leading to war or other evils see *Sib. Or.* 3.234–236, 640–641; *Pss. Sol.* 17.33.

¹³⁸ For equally condemnatory speeches against the rich in the *Epistle of Enoch*, see 96.4; 97.8–10; 98.1–4; 103.6. For a study that looks at the wealth motif in the fifth book of *1 Enoch*, see George Nickelsburg, “Riches, the Rich, and God’s Judgment in *1 Enoch* 92–105 and the Gospel according to Luke,” *NTS* 25 (1979): 324–44; idem, *Resurrection, Immortality, and Eternal Life*, 141–62; see also Royalty, *Streets of Heaven*, 56–57.

¹³⁹ Perhaps this is what the author Pseudo-Phocylides has in mind when he states that “the love of money is the mother of all evil” (42; cf. *Sib. Or.* 2.111). See too Sir 26:29; 29:1–28; 31:1–19.

not take refuge in God, but trusted in abundant riches, and sought refuge in wealth!" (Ps 52:7).¹⁴⁰ Ezekiel condemns Israel on the same grounds:

They [Israel] shall fling their silver into the streets, their gold shall be treated as unclean. Their silver and gold cannot save them on the day of the wrath of the Lord. They shall not satisfy their hunger or fill their stomachs with it. For it was the stumbling block of their iniquity. From their beautiful ornament, in which they took pride, they made their abominable images, their detestable things; therefore I will make of it an unclean thing to them. (Ezek 7:19–20)

Israel is condemned here for three reasons: they put their trust in wealth rather than God, they took "pride" in their wealth,¹⁴¹ and they fashioned their gold and silver into idolatrous figures.¹⁴²

One iteration of the abuse of wealth is in the form of accumulating wealth by unjust means.¹⁴³ For example, the *Sibylline Oracles* repeatedly raises this issue, stating "Do not gain wealth unjustly, but live from legitimate things" (*Sib. Or.* 2.56). Similarly, the author of *1 Enoch* also warns against "acquir[ing] gold and silver unjustly" (*1 En.* 97.8).

Sometimes the abuse of wealth is not in how one accumulates it, but in what one does with the wealth they already have. In this way, hoarding or unwillingness to give is just as condemnable as amassing wealth unjustly.¹⁴⁴ And in the *Apocalypse of Zephaniah*, lending money at interest lands

¹⁴⁰ For trusting in God versus trusting in wealth, see Jer 9:23–24; Zeph 1:18.

¹⁴¹ Regarding the issue of pride and wealth, Ezekiel later condemns Tyre on this very point, stating that their riches and successes have increased their pride such that they compare themselves with God. As a result of this pride, Ezekiel prophesies that the Lord will strike down Tyre (Ezek 28:1–10; cp. Isa 23:1–18).

¹⁴² The link between idolatry and wealth is a strong one in Jewish literature because idols are commonly made gold and silver and are thus an indication not just of one's religious preferences but of one's socio-economic status (see Exod 20:23; 32:1–6; Judg 17:4; Isa 2:20; 40:19; Hos 2:8; Ep Jer 1:4; *Sib. Or.* 3.13–14, 586–90; 5.83–84; 3 *En.* 5.7). This link can be seen in Deuteronomy when God commands the Israelites to dispossess the land but to leave the gold and silver: "The images of their gods you shall burn with fire. Do not covet the silver or the gold that is on them and take it for yourself, because you could be ensnared by it; for it is abhorrent to the LORD your God" (Deut 7:25).

¹⁴³ For more on just and unjust wealth see also Jer 17:11; Mic 6:11–12; Sir 5:8; 40:13; *Sib. Or.* 2.109–118; 3.188–189; Ps.–Phoc. 5, 10. In a description of the eschaton the people are described as having "just wealth" (*Sib. Or.* 3.783). In *Sib. Or.* 5.416–417 a savior figure, perhaps the messiah, is said to "[give] back the wealth to all the good, which previous men had taken," suggesting a reversal of fortunes for both those who had wealth taken from them, but perhaps more importantly, those who gained wealth unjustly.

¹⁴⁴ Sir 29:1–29; Tob 12:8; *Sib. Or.* 3.41–42, 180–182.

troubled souls in the fires of Hades (*Apoc. Zeph.* 10.7).¹⁴⁵ Philo combats this problem suggesting that those who have received wealth in abundance through obedience to God's laws are to give their money to those in need and not just to other Jews but to all nations (*Praem.* 107).

It is not always individuals, however, that are condemned for improper uses of wealth, but also societies at large. So, for example, in Ezekiel 27–28, the Lord rebukes the city of Tyre for its abuse of wealth (cf. Isa 23:1–18).¹⁴⁶ And again, in the *Sibylline Oracles* Rome is singled out as particularly evil because of its exaggerated displays of wealth: “Alas, when will that day come, and the judgment of the great king immortal God? Yet, just for the present, be founded, cities, and all be embellished with temples and stadia, markets and golden silver and stone statues so that you may come to the bitter day. For it [judgment] will come, when the smell of brimstone spreads among all men” (*Sib. Or.* 3.55–61; cf. 3.350–364).

To conclude this section on the abuse of wealth, it is worth recalling that the line between riches as evil *per se* and the use and abuse of riches as evil is a line that does not always exist in the minds of the ancient authors. It is possible that speaking of riches is simply a short-hand way of speaking of the abuses of riches, but given the vitriol toward wealth found in much of the Jewish literature, it seems that riches are viewed as having an extraordinarily high propensity for leading one astray and are for some, therefore, toxic in and of themselves. Such a conflation of the improper use of money and money as evil *per se* is found in the following quote from the *Testament of Judah*: “My children, love of money leads to idolatry, because once they are led astray by money, they designate as gods those who are not gods. It makes anyone who has it go out of his mind” (19.1). The statement begins by locating the problem with the “love of money” but finishes by saying that money itself causes one to lose his mind.¹⁴⁷

3.3.2.3. *The Great Reversal*

There is a strong Jewish tradition that the eschaton will be a time of great reversal.¹⁴⁸ Those who had power in this life will receive a bad lot in the

¹⁴⁵ The prohibition against lending with interest is common throughout the Hebrew Scripture: Exod 22:25; Lev 25:36–37; Deut 23:19–20; Neh 5:7, 10–11; Prov 28:8; Ezek 18:8, 13, 17; 22:12.

¹⁴⁶ For a discussion of Tyre, see Royalty, *The Streets of Heaven*, 63–70; Mathews, “Riches, Poverty, and the Faithful,” 237–50.

¹⁴⁷ See also *T. Iss.* 4.2.

¹⁴⁸ Though the reversal is often in terms of wealth imagery, Jewish literature is capable of using any number of metaphors to reflect this change in reality. For example, desert

eschaton while those who did not will be blessed. Zechariah states that in the eschaton Judah's lot will be increased at the expense of the rich and powerful around them: "And the wealth of all the surrounding nations shall be collected—gold, silver, and garments in great abundance" (14:14; cf. 14:1). The *Similitudes* repeatedly mentions kings, rulers, landlords, and officials as those who will be punished.¹⁴⁹ During the time of judgment, the powerful are said to recognize and bow down before God and praise him as the "Lord of kings, and the Lord of the mighty and the Lord of the rich" (1 En. 63.2). And yet for these figures, their obeisance is too late; judgment will still be served. These titles—kings, rulers, landlords, and officials—, therefore, serve to condemn, and it is the powerful and rich who are ultimately judged. Some of these even lament that had they known that God was indeed the "Lord of kings" in their lifetimes, they would have glorified him at that time (63.5).¹⁵⁰ Nevertheless, they recognize, "Our hope was on the scepter of our kingdom," and they confess, "Our lives are full of ill-gotten wealth, but it does not prevent us from descending into the flame of the torture of Sheol" (63.7, 10). The unjust gain and abuse of wealth and power is squarely on trial here.

Philo appeals to the tradition of the great reversal and amends it in a way that is characteristically Philonic. He speaks of a reversal both in the eschaton and in the present on a philosophical level. In his treatise, *Every Good Man is Free*, he writes that in contrast to what may seem obvious, the rich are often poor and the poor rich in the here and now, an idea he recognizes as seemingly "unreasonable," "preposterous" and even "insane." Philo, however, does not simply reverse the roles of the rich and poor, as if having wealth is in actuality to be lacking wealth and vice versa, but instead he aims to redefine the terms such that wealth and riches are not equated with money but with virtue.¹⁵¹ Using the language of freedom and slavery, this treatise is a syncrisis of what Philo calls freedom of the soul and freedom of the body (*Prob.* 17). Not surprisingly, he values the former over the latter and shows that, even in the present age, true wealth is more closely linked to virtue than to riches. In order to emphasize this point, he holds up the Essenes as a group that embodies the love of virtue

lands sprout vegetation and stream with water, the weak are made strong, the blind are made to see, and those who are downtrodden are made joyous. Isaiah 35:1–7, e.g., employs a number of such metaphors (cf. Isa 41:18–19; 43:19–20; 44:3–4; 51:3; 55:13; 65:17–25).

¹⁴⁹ See especially 1 En. 62.1–63.12. Royalty, *Streets of Heaven*, 44–45.

¹⁵⁰ There are significant similarities with Lazarus and the rich man in Luke 16:19–31.

¹⁵¹ Philo, *Quod Omnis Probus Liber Sit*.

over the accumulation of wealth. He notes that the Essenes do not hoard wealth as individuals; instead, the individual Essene is moneyless and landless, and, yet as a collective, they hold all of their wealth in common, giving each a sufficient amount of food, clothing and shelter and leaving no one in need.¹⁵²

In his treatise *On Rewards and Punishments*, however, he speaks of the life to come and uses the language of reversal to describe what that life will be like:

The cities which but now lay in ruins will be cities once more; the desolate land will be inhabited; the barren will change into fruitfulness; all the prosperity of their fathers and ancestors will seem a tiny fragment, so lavish will be the abundant riches in their possession, which flowing from the gracious bounties of God as from a perennial fountain will bring to each individually and to all in common a deep stream of wealth leaving no room for envy. Everything will suddenly be reversed, God will turn the curses against the enemies of these penitents. (*Praem.* 168–169 [Colson, LCL])

Though Philo is capable of reordering the present world in such a way as to change the values of riches and wealth, he ultimately holds out hope for a great reversal in the eschaton at which time the righteous and virtuous will be rewarded and the unrighteous punished.¹⁵³ As he puts it, “Everything will suddenly be reversed.”

A common motif in apocalyptic literature is that one should expect suffering in this life, but one should not despair over this because the future will hold blessing for those who endure. *Second Baruch* states boldly that this life is not to be valued because it will, quite naturally, be filled with hardship for the righteous. Instead, one should look to the future for one’s reward: “Therefore, nothing of the present things should come into your heart, but they should, on the contrary, be expected, since that which was promised will come. And we should not look upon the delights of the present nations, but let us think about that which has been promised to us regarding the end” (2 *Bar.* 83.4–5). Later in that same chapter the author lists a litany of desires one might have in this life—joy, delight, health, youth, and riches—only to say that all these things will be changed into death and destruction (83.11–23). What is good in this life will not be so in the next, and for those who struggle through this life, there is hope

¹⁵² See especially *Prob.* 76–78, 86, 91; *Hypoth.* 11.4. See also Josephus, *Ant.* 18.20; *J.W.* 2.122, 127; Pliny, *Nat.* 5.17.4.

¹⁵³ For more on the eschatology of Philo, see Grabbe, “Eschatology in Philo and Josephus.”

for relief in the next. It should be noted, however, that, for the author of 2 *Baruch*, a hard life in this world does not automatically give one a free pass to the blessed afterlife. He warns his reader to “prepare your heart for that which you believed before, lest you should be excluded from both worlds, namely, that you were carried away into captivity here and tormented there” (2 *Bar.* 83.8).¹⁵⁴

3.3.2.4. *Wealth as Positive*

In ancient Judaism, wealth and riches were not always depicted as an evil or even as a means to such. The Hebrew Scripture occasional uses wealth imagery positively. For example, in Isaac’s marriage to Rebekah he offers gold, silver, and jewelry (Gen 24:22, 53), jewels are an integral part of the high priest’s breastplate (Exod 28:17–20; 29:10–13), and Proverbs uses gold, silver, and jewels as a standard for goodness by which other good things are compared (Prov 3:14; 8:10, 19; 22:1; 25:11–12). A positive portrayal of wealth and wealthy materials is most notable in the description of the building of the temple and Solomon’s palace from 1 Kgs 5:1–8:66 (2 Chr 3:1–7:22). The temple is described as covered in gold, and its base is made from costly stones (e.g. 1 Kgs 5:17; 6:18–23). The palace is described with similar opulence (1 Kings 7). The mention of gold and costly stones is meant to accentuate the grandeur of both places, the house of the king and the house of the King of kings (1 Kgs 6:13).¹⁵⁵ In Ezekiel, precious stones and gold are used to convey the beauty of Eden (Ezek 28:13).¹⁵⁶ And in Isaiah, precious stones act as the foundation of the eschatological city of the oppressed (Jerusalem), creating a scenario of the great reversal (Isa 54:11–12; cf. Tob 13:16–17). The great reversal is brought to completion in the final chapters of Isaiah when the “wealth of the nations,” including gold, silver, and frankincense, is brought to Israel (Isa 60:5–6, 9, 17; 61:6; 66:12; cf. Zech 14:14).¹⁵⁷

¹⁵⁴ That the oppressed should look forward to a reversal is also found in the *Testament of Judah*: “And those who died in sorrow shall be raised in joy; and those who died in poverty for the Lord’s sake shall be made rich” (25.4). This passage explicitly uses the language of wealth and riches to make the point that one should not despair for the world to come will contain all that one could wish for.

¹⁵⁵ See also a similar description of the temple with great opulence in *Let. Aris.* 51–120; Josephus, *Ant.* 8.1–98.

¹⁵⁶ Though it is not as precious a commodity as gold, silver, or certain stones, iron and copper are mentioned in Deut 8:9 as part of the utopian landscape of the promised land.

¹⁵⁷ For more examples of positive regard for wealth, see Ps 112:3; Prov 8:18–21; Philo, *Praem.* 98–107. Further, for some authors a moderate amount of wealth is acceptable, but too much wealth is the road to ruin. *Psalms of Solomon* 5.16–17 is an example of this:

Positive descriptions of wealth are also found in the Second Temple period. For example, the author of Sirach writes, "Good things and bad, life and death, poverty and wealth, come from the Lord" (11:14). In another example, the author the *Sibylline Oracles* book 3, in an encomium on the Jews, praises the Jews for their use of money saying,

they care for righteousness and virtue and not love of money. . . . They do not carry out robberies at night against each other . . . nor does a very rich man grieve a lesser man nor oppress widows in any respect, but rather helps them, always going to their aid with corn, wine and oil. Always a prosperous man among the people gives a share of the harvest to those who have nothing, but are poor, fulfilling the word of the great God, the hymn of the law, for the Heavenly One gave the earth in common to all. (3:234–235, 237, 241–247)¹⁵⁸

This passage is helpful for discussing the proper and improper uses of wealth because, in its positive description of the Jews, it addresses many of the abuses discussed above, but, in what is clearly an idealized description, it states that the Jews do not partake in these abuses but do the opposite. The wealthy Jewish people, therefore, do not put their trust in money but in righteousness; they do not build wealth through unjust gain (i.e. robbery); and they do not use their power to hurt the poor but instead help them through generosity.

This passage from the *Sibylline Oracles* ends with a common Greco-Roman utopian motif, i.e. that the earth belongs to all people in common. This sentiment, one not found as frequently in Jewish literature as it is in the Greco-Roman literature (more common is the idea that all belongs to God, see below), is expressed in book 2 of the *Sibylline Oracles* which describes a blessed afterlife in which the economic playing field will be leveled and all will share everything in common. The communist tendencies so prevalent in Greco-Roman literature, including the giving up of private property, surface clearly here: "The earth will belong equally to all, undivided by walls or fences. . . . Lives will be in common and wealth will have no division. For there will be no poor man there, no rich, and no tyrant, no slave. . . . All will be on a par together" (2:319–324).¹⁵⁹

"Happy is (the person) whom God remembers with a moderate sufficiency; for if one is excessively rich, he sins. Moderate (wealth) is adequate—with righteousness; for with this comes the Lord's blessing: to be (more than) satisfied with righteousness."

¹⁵⁸ As Collins in the *OTP* notes, this last statement is a stoic ideal as mentioned above in chapter 2. It is not as prevalent in Jewish writings. For "wealthy Jews," see also *Sib. Or.* 5:261.

¹⁵⁹ Another example of having all things in common might be Ps.-Phoc. 30, though the meaning of the statement is not entirely clear.

While it is possible that this passage is drawing on Greco-Roman communistic ideals, especially given the Hellenistic nature of the literature, there are passages from the Hebrew Scripture that lend themselves to communistic ideals and are worth mentioning. Regarding the land, for example, Lev 25:23 states: “the land is mine; with me you are but aliens and tenants.” The idea that all the earth and everything in it belongs to God is a commonplace in the Psalms (Pss 24:1; 50:12; 89:11; cf. Deut 10:14; 1 Chr 29:11). That humans do not possess land but borrow from God is certainly a twist on the communistic ideal that all people share all things in common.

Further, communistic tendencies arise in passages concerning the sabbatical year—every seventh year when all debt is erased and slaves freed—and the year of jubilee—every fiftieth year when Israel is to press the “reset button” reducing the gap between the haves and the have nots (Lev 25:8–55; Deut 15:1–18). Deuteronomy 15:4–5 clearly states that if the sabbatical year command is obeyed no one will be in need because all people will be cared for, and those who have will give “liberally” and “ungrudgingly” to those in need (15:14). Though the sabbatical year is not communistic in the full sense of sharing all things in common, that in the seventh year all debt should be forgiven, all slaves should be freed, and all fields and vineyards should be left fallow for the sake of the poor suggests a sharing of one’s wealth as part of the utopian social order (Exod 21:2; 23:10–12; Lev 25:1–7; Deut 15:1–15).

For a fully Greco-Roman communistic ideal, Philo describes the Essenes as a group of people who share all things in common, including land, money, clothing, food, and even housing (*Prob.* 76–77, 85–87; see too Josephus, *Ant.* 18.20; *J.W.* 2.122, 127). They are said to be deliberately moneyless and landless, a fact that makes them stand out among all of humanity, and because they willingly place all of their money in a common fund, no one has need. No other Jewish group, even Philo’s Therapeutae, comes close to this level of communism.¹⁶⁰

¹⁶⁰ Emily Fairey, “Slavery in the Classical Utopia: A Comparative Study,” (Ph.D. diss., The City University of New York, 2006), 222–35. Amit has tried to argue that the Edenic narrative in Genesis contains a communistic element that removes private property, but this is an untenable position (Amit, “Biblical Utopianism,” 15). While Amit’s reading of Genesis would certainly find an audience among Gentile Stoics and even a few Hellenistic Jews with Stoic tendencies (such as the authors of the *Sibylline Oracles*, Pseudo-Phocylides, and possibly Philo), the vast majority of the Jewish tradition does not show a concern over private property. Unlike the Greco-Roman traditions regarding property in utopia, the Jewish traditions that seek to eradicate personal property altogether or to set up a socialist economy are few and far between.

In conclusion, Jewish attitudes toward wealth varied in the ancient world. There is evidence to suggest that for some, wealth and those with wealth were inherently evil, for others, attitudes toward wealth were more nuanced with the common belief that money and possessions could lead to one's demise, and yet there were still others who were willing to amass wealth so long as one maintained a proper attitude toward wealth and one used wealth toward proper ends. Amidst this diversity, particularly for those with an apocalyptic worldview, was the common belief that a great reversal was to be expected at the eschaton at which time those who are impoverished in this life will be blessed and those who are rich will not be.

3.3.3. *The Temple*

In ancient Judaism, the temple marks the location of God's presence among his people and, therefore, the holiest place on earth (1 Kgs 6:13; 8:13, 27). Because of this, the importance of the temple's role in Jewish literature is difficult to overstate. Whether Edenic, nationalistic, or eschatological utopianism, each expression of utopianism contains expectations about the temple.

In some Edenic literature, the garden of Eden is compared to or even equated with the temple or sanctuary.¹⁶¹ For example, in the retelling of the Eden narrative in *Jubilees*, Eve is not allowed into the garden until after a waiting period of eighty days (3.9–12; cf. 4Q265 7 II, 11–17). The reasoning for this seemingly strange anecdote, one not found in the Genesis account, is that because Eden was such an exceedingly holy place, comparable to the sanctuary itself, the laws meant for keeping the sanctuary pure must certainly have applied to Eden as well.¹⁶² Leviticus 12:5 states that after a woman gives birth to a female “she shall be unclean two weeks, as

¹⁶¹ For an excellent article on the relationship between Eden and the temple, see Ruiten, “Eden and the Temple.” For other texts that closely link the temple and Eden, see 4Q265 7 II, 11–17; 2 Bar. 4.3–6; Ps.-Philo, *L.A.B.* 19.13 (on *L.A.B.* see Bauckham, “Paradise in Pseudo-Philo,” 53). See also Martha Himmelfarb, “The Temple and the Garden of Eden in Ezekiel, the Book of the Watchers, and the Wisdom of ben Sira,” in *Sacred Places and Profane Spaces: Essays in the Geographies of Judaism, Christianity, and Islam* (ed. J. Scott and P. Simpson-Housley; New York: Greenwood Press, 1991), 63–78; Baumgarten, “4Q500 and the Ancient Conception of the Lord's Vineyard,” 1–6; Gordon Wenham, “Sanctuary Symbolism in the Garden of Eden,” in *I Studied Inscriptions from before the Flood: Ancient Near Eastern, Literary, and Linguistic Approaches to Genesis 1–11* (Sources for Biblical and Theological Study 4; ed. R. Hess and D. Tsumura; Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 1994), 399–404.

¹⁶² In *Jub.* 4.26 the author states that there are four sacred places on the earth: Eden, Mount Zion, Mount Sinai and Mount Qater. It is unclear exactly what is meant by Mount Qater. In 8.19 the author mentions only three holy places: Eden, Zion, and Sinai.

in her menstruation; her time of blood purification shall be sixty-six days." The logic of *Jubilees* is clear: just as a woman who has borne a girl has to wait eighty days to enter the temple, so also Eve who had been part of the "birthing" process had to wait eighty days to enter Eden because Eden and the temple are equally holy places. The holiness of Eden is made explicit in *Jub.* 3.12: "And when she finished those eighty days, we brought her into the garden of Eden because it is more holy than any land."¹⁶³ But it is not until 8.19 that the author of *Jubilees* explicitly connects Eden and the temple: "And he knew that the garden of Eden was the holy of holies and the dwelling of the Lord." That Eden is described here as God's dwelling place is of interest because *Jubilees* 3 lacks any reference to God "walking in the cool of the day" as one finds in Gen 3:8. In fact, God's presence in the garden is entirely muted in *Jubilees*' account of Eden and is replaced with the presence of angels.¹⁶⁴

Nationalistic utopias also cast the temple in utopian terms. The description of Solomon's building of the temple (1 Kgs 5:1–8:66) is itself utopian employing eight of the fourteen utopian *topoi* most notably the lavish use of precious metals, displays of wealth and the presence of peace as a prerequisite for building the temple. The utopian nature of the temple is even more evident in the *Letter of Aristeas* (51–120), a point recognized by Moses Hadas, who goes so far as to compare it with Greco-Roman geographers who wrote "fantastic accounts of incredible places and people."¹⁶⁵ Most notably, the land around the temple is described as follows:

Their land is thickly covered with large numbers of olive trees and corn crops and pulse, and moreover with vines and abundant honey. As for the fruit trees and date palms which they have, no number can be given. They have many flocks and herds of various kinds, with ample pasture for them. . . . A large quantity of spices and precious stones and gold is brought to the area by means of the Arabs. (*Let. Aris.* 112–114)

The abundance of food, wine, flocks, and cattle, along with the presence of precious stones and gold, all signal a utopian setting.¹⁶⁶

¹⁶³ For a discussion regarding this passage from *Jubilees* and equating the purity laws with laws for Eden, see García Martínez, "Man and Woman," 109–115; Ruiten, "Eden and the Temple," 76–77.

¹⁶⁴ See below under the *topos* "Divine Presence."

¹⁶⁵ Hadas, *Aristeas to Philocrates (Letter of Aristeas)* (New York: Harper, 1951), 49. Hadas even uses the term "utopia" to speak about Aristeas' description of the temple.

¹⁶⁶ Though less utopian in nature, Josephus describes the Herodian temple as decorated with gold and silver (*J.W.* 5:201–214).

Traditions about the temple in the eschaton are prevalent in biblical and early Jewish literature.¹⁶⁷ In the Hebrew Scripture, the temple makes an appearance in the eschaton.¹⁶⁸ Ezekiel 40–48 contains a lengthy description of the eschatological temple, one that has significant import for later traditions.¹⁶⁹ The presence and restoration of the temple in the eschaton is here part of a symbolic world that locates the source of all life at the temple itself with a river of living water flowing from it and trees that bring healing alongside the river. Ezekiel concludes the vision of the eschatological Jerusalem, and the book as a whole, with the recognition that God's presence is the primary characteristic of the reestablished Jerusalem when its name is changed to יהוה שמה, "The LORD is There" (Ezek 48:35).

One matter of interest for Second Temple beliefs about the temple concerns whether or not the true temple is located on earth or in the heavens. In 2 *Baruch*, one finds in the same document both traditions. *Second Baruch* 4.2–3 suggests that the earthly temple is going to be replaced with the temple that was "prepared from the moment that [God] decided to create Paradise" and presently is located in the heavens along with paradise. As Aune rightly notes, this heavenly temple "is to be revealed" (4.3) as part of the renewal of the earth at the eschaton.¹⁷⁰ He notes too, however, that 2 *Baruch* contains a tradition in which the vessels of the earthly temple were hidden in the earth until the last days (6.7–9; 80.2; a tradition also found in 2 Macc 2:4–8; *Lives of the Prophets* 2.11–18; 4 *Bar.* 3.8–11), "a tradition that presupposes the eventual restoration of the earthly temple."¹⁷¹ These two traditions, one of a restored earthly temple and one of a revealed heavenly temple, stand side-by-side in 2 *Baruch*.

¹⁶⁷ For secondary literature on the eschatological temple, see especially Elizabeth Ann Gaines, "The Eschatological Jerusalem"; Robert A. Briggs, *Jewish Temple Imagery in the Book of Revelation* (Studies in Biblical Literature 10; New York: Peter Lang, 1999); Aune, "From the Idealized Past to the Imaginary Future," 13–38.

¹⁶⁸ Joel 3:18; Mic 4:1; Zech 14:20–21; Isa 60:7, 13.

¹⁶⁹ David Aune comments, "Ezek 40–48 had a significant impact on subsequent apocalyptic conceptions, though specific features of this eschatological vision were never reproduced without significant revision among later authors" ("From the Idealized Past to the Imaginary Future," 26).

¹⁷⁰ Aune, "From the Idealized Past to the Imaginary Future," 29. Contra Frederick J. Murphy, *The Structure and Meaning of Second Baruch* (SBLDS 78; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1985), 88.

¹⁷¹ Aune, "From the Idealized Past to the Imaginary Future," 29. Aune cites 2 *Bar.* 69.7–9 as a source for this tradition, but he certainly means 6.7–9. For more on this tradition, see also Marilyn F. Collins, "The Hidden Vessels in Samaritan Traditions," *JSJ* 3 (1972): 97–116.

Second Baruch is unique not only in that it contains both heavenly and earthly temple traditions, but also in that it connects the heavenly temple to the eschatological vision. In 2 *Bar.* 4.3, it is clear that the heavenly temple will be revealed in the time of the eschaton. Other texts from early Jewish writings that contain a heavenly temple typically reserve that space for God alone and in no way connect it to the eschaton.¹⁷²

For an earthly, eschatological temple, one can turn to the *Sibylline Oracles*.¹⁷³ In book 3 of the *Sibylline Oracles*, the last days are described as filled with war and chaos, and the temple itself is singled out as a target. At this time, God is said to protect the temple and his people in a miraculous way. "But the sons of the great God will all live peacefully around the Temple, rejoicing in these things which the Creator, just judge and sole ruler, will give. For he alone will shield them, standing by them magnificently as if he had a wall of blazing fire round about. They will be free from war in towns and county" (3.702–707). The author must certainly have been writing prior to the fall of the temple in 70 CE because the temple is not only standing but is also expected to continue on into perpetuity in the blessed afterlife when the unrighteous are judged and the righteous remain.

Tobit also envisions an earthly temple that is rebuilt and outstrips the glory of the present one. The author writes: "But God will again have mercy on them, and God will bring them back into the land of Israel; and they will rebuild the temple of God, but not like the first one until the period when the times of fulfillment shall come. After this they all will

¹⁷² There are two texts to which scholars most often point as examples of the heavenly temple. First, chapter 14 of the *Book of Watchers* describes Enoch taken up into the heavens where he sees a vision of the heavenly temple, which is described in paradoxical terms (1 *En.* 14.8–25; cf. Briggs, *Jewish Temple Imagery*, 114; Spatafora, *From the "Temple of God,"* 72–75). Its walls are made of hailstones and fire, the floor is of snow but the interior contained doors of fire and fiery cherubim, and the house is said to be "hot as fire and cold as snow" (1 *En.* 14.13). The second text is *T. Levi* 3.5–6 and 5.1 in which the author is taken on a heavenly journey through multiple heavens (The number of heavens is unclear since there are two versions of the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*; α has three and β has seven heavens). In the third heaven he find the temple of God with the Holy of Holies and the archangels offering sacrifices for sins of ignorance. The text states, "They present to the Lord a pleasing odor, a rational and bloodless oblation" (*T. Levi* 3.6). Neither the *Testament of Levi* nor the *Book of Watchers*, however, connects the heavenly temple to the eschaton. *Second Baruch* is the only Jewish text where one finds this connection. Other, less descriptive, texts of a heavenly temple include 3 *En.* 45; 3 *Bar.* 11–16; *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice*; cf. Andrea Spatafora, *From the "Temple of God" to God as the Temple: A Biblical Theological Study of the Temple in the Book of Revelation* (Tesi Gregoriana Serie Teologia 27; Rome: Gregorian University Press, 1997), 71–86.

¹⁷³ Besides book 3, see also *Sib. Or.* 5.420–427. Cf. *Jub.* 1.29.

return from their exile and will rebuild Jerusalem in splendor; and in it the temple of God will be rebuilt, just as the prophets of Israel have said concerning it" (*Tob.* 14.5). The *Testament of Benjamin* speaks similarly of an eschatological earthly temple that will surpass that of the previous, "But in your allotted place will be the temple of God, and the latter temple will exceed the former in glory. The twelve tribes shall be gathered there and all the nations" (*T. Benj.* 9.2).

3.3.4. *Rivers/Water*

Rivers play a role in each of the three expressions of utopianism. The Pentateuch repeatedly casts the promised land as a locative-temporal utopia through the use of a short but effective phrase: "the land flowing with milk and honey." This phrase conjures up images of an idyllic paradise in which the worries of the world are minimal, especially when set against the backdrop of life under oppression in Egypt.¹⁷⁴ The Genesis Eden narrative describes the garden with four rivers that help mark out the territory of the garden (2:10–14).¹⁷⁵ And, finally, there are numerous afterlife descriptions in which rivers, fountains, or at the very least large bodies of water play a significant role. Attention will be focused here on these three themes: first, the use of the phrase "a land flowing with milk and honey," second, the presence of bodies of water in the eschaton, and finally, the river that many Jewish texts say will flow from the temple and Jerusalem, a city that has no rivers.

3.3.4.1. "A Land Flowing with Milk and Honey"¹⁷⁶

This phrase appears frequently throughout the Pentateuch and once in Joshua, but, outside of these books, other biblical authors sparsely use the phrase. It occurs in Jeremiah and Ezekiel, once in the deuterocanonical texts of Sirach and Baruch, and not at all in the New Testament.¹⁷⁷

¹⁷⁴ A good example of this is Deuteronomy 8.

¹⁷⁵ Josephus connects these rivers to rivers located in vastly different parts of the earth (*Ant.* 1.38–39). Genesis' Phison he connects to the Ganges, the Tigris and Euphrates are left as is, and he connects the Geon to the Nile.

¹⁷⁶ The phrase is used in the following pentateuchal texts: Exod 3:8, 17; 13:5; 33:3; Lev 20:24; Num 13:27; 14:8; 16:13, 14; Deut 6:3; 11:9; 26:9, 15; 27:3; 31:20. Outside of the Pentateuch it is used much less frequently: Josh 5:6; Jer 11:5; 32:22; Ezek 20:6, 15. See also Sir 46:8; Bar 1:20.

¹⁷⁷ See Beavis, *Jesus and Utopia*, 36–37; Bremmer, *The Rise and Fall of the Afterlife*, 121–23; Levine, "The Land of Milk and Honey," *JSOT* 87 (2000): 43–57. Dershowitz has recently argued that the Hebrew should be translated "a land flowing with fat and honey" ("A Land

Such a steady decline in the phrase's usage has led J. Duncan Derrett to ask, "Whatever happened to the land flowing with milk and honey?"¹⁷⁸ Derrett argues that the "death" of rivers of milk and honey among Hebraic and Jewish writers can be attributed to the converse rise in popularity of rivers of milk and honey (and wine) in Hellenistic culture, particularly with regard to Bacchus and Hellenistic paradise motifs.¹⁷⁹ He states that because of the popularity of this motif in Greco-Roman myth, "the notion of *streams of milk or honey* . . . had become a feature of that highly objectionable item called 'avôdâ zarâ ('strange worship') i.e. idolatry."¹⁸⁰

Derrett's hypothesis suffers, however, from his lack of interaction with a number of important Jewish texts that directly bear on this topic.¹⁸¹ First, the phrase is mentioned in *Jub.* 1.7 (cf. 4Q216 II 3) and again at Qumran in 4Q378 (*Apocryphon of Joshua*). Though *Jubilees* dates prior to both Sirach and Baruch (documents also containing the phrase), its presence suggests that the supposed "death" of this phrase might not be quite as widespread as Derrett initially states, as do the two instances of the phrase at Qumran. Regarding 4Q378, though the text has some lacunas, the overall meaning is quite easily understood: "[God] swore to Abraham to give [. . .] good and spacious, a land of streams of water, [of springs and well-heads which gush in the p]lain and on the mountain, a land of wheat and grain, [. . . olive oil and] honey, for it is a land which flows with milk and honey [. . . who]se [st]ones are iron and whose mountains are copper . . ." (11 3–7 [García Martínez and Tigchelaar]). The text is almost certainly quoting parts of Deut 8:7–9, a text that describes the promised land as a locative-temporal utopia. It is interesting, however, that Deuteronomy 8 does not use the phrase "flowing with milk and honey," and thus the writer of the apocryphon must have intentionally added it to the text. This, of course, is significant

Flowing with Fat and Honey," VT 60 [2010]: 172–76]). The author uses biblical and Ugaritic evidence to support this claim. Dershowitz does not, however, mention later Jewish tradition, none of which translates חלב (milk) as fat and all of which translates it as milk. This is not to say that the author is necessarily wrong; it is to say that the earliest Jewish readings of this text suggest he is wrong.

¹⁷⁸ J. Duncan Derrett, "Whatever Happened to the Land Flowing with Milk and Honey?" VC 38 (1984): 178–84.

¹⁷⁹ For a list of Greco-Roman sources, see Derrett, "Whatever Happened to the Land Flowing with Milk and Honey?," 180–81.

¹⁸⁰ Derrett, "Whatever Happened to the Land Flowing with Milk and Honey?," 181.

¹⁸¹ To the list below, one might add the *Letter of Aristeas* which defines the land of Jerusalem as abundant in olive trees, vines, and honey (*Let. Aris.* 112).

because it suggests that at least this Jewish author was in no way concerned with avoiding the phrase but was quite comfortable with it.¹⁸²

But perhaps more important than either of the Qumran references and the reference in *Jubilees* is Derrett's failure to address the *Sibylline Oracles* and *2 Enoch*, documents that significantly address the matter. Beginning with *2 Enoch*, there is a vivid description of the heavenly Eden in chapter 8 that mentions two rivers: one of milk and honey, and another of oil and wine (*2 En.* 8.5). Not only is this an example of the presence of milk and honey, but wine is also added to the list—a fact that, according to Derrett's hypothesis, should have made the Jewish author far too uncomfortable to make it part of the text.¹⁸³

Moving to the *Sibylline Oracles*, these same four liquids show up.¹⁸⁴ In book three, perhaps the first of the oracles to be written, there is a description of an eschatological time when honey is said to come from heaven, and there are "sweet fountains of white milk" (*Sib. Or.* 3.744–749). Though rivers are not mentioned, that milk, honey, wine, and oil are found in such close proximity to one another in the text is enough to suggest a correlation with the Greco-Roman rivers of the same substances. Also, in book 2, again describing an eschatological utopia, the author states the following: "But as for the others, as many as were concerned with justice and noble deeds, and piety and most righteous thoughts, angels will lift them through the blazing river and bring them to light and to life without care, in which is the immortal path of the great God and three springs of wine, honey, and milk" (*Sib. Or.* 2.313–318). One final text from book 5 of the *Sibylline Oracles* contains a similar utopian description, this time of the land of Israel, "the holy land," a place with "a honey-sweet stream"

¹⁸² Dating 4Q378 is difficult because of the lack of clues, but Carol Newsom suggest late-second or early-first century BCE based on possible reference to either Simon or John Hyrcanus ("4Q378 and 4Q379: An Apocryphon of Joshua," in *Qumranstudien: Vorträge und Beiträge der Teilnehmer des Qumranseminars auf dem internationalen Treffen der Society of Biblical Literature, Münster, 25.–26. Juli 1993* [Schriften des Institutum Judaicum Delitzschianum 4; ed. H. J. Fabry, A. Lange, H. Lichtenberger; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1996], 36).

¹⁸³ There are only two texts in the Hebrew Scripture that hint at the possibility of rivers of wine: Joel 3:18, "In that day the mountains shall drip sweet wine, the hills shall flow with milk, and all the stream beds of Judah shall flow with water; a fountain shall come forth from the house of the LORD and water the Wadi Shittim"; and Amos 9:13, "The time is surely coming, says the LORD, when . . . the mountains shall drip sweet wine, and all the hills shall flow with it." While it is possible the author of *2 Enoch* has echoed one of these two passages, it is more likely that the text is an echo of a Greco-Roman tradition.

¹⁸⁴ For interaction with milk and honey in the *Sibylline Oracles*, see Bremmer, *The Rise and Fall of the Afterlife*, 120–23.

where “heavenly milk will flow” (*Sib. Or.* 5.281–282). This description plays on the notion of rivers of milk and honey, though it clearly uses them metaphorically. Nevertheless, the imagery of flowing milk and honey is suggestive.

To conclude, the wealth of references to milk and honey throughout the *Sibylline Oracles*, 2 *Enoch*, the Dead Sea Scrolls and even *Jubilees* suggests that the phrase was indeed alive and well during this period. The tradition may not be all-pervasive, but there are enough examples from early Judaism to suggest a strong presence.

3.3.4.2. *Water in the Eschaton*

The Greco-Roman literature has a well-known tradition that one must cross the Acheron river via the ferryman Charon before one can enter the afterlife. Further, in the Greco-Roman afterlife are rivers such as the river Lethe, which one crosses in order to forget their past life and either enter into a blessed afterlife or return to earth in a reincarnation of oneself. While bodies of water in the afterlife may be par for the course within Hellenism, it is not nearly as common in Jewish literature. Nevertheless, the theme appears enough to warrant mentioning a few passages that employ this theme.

In the Hebrew Scripture, there is no indication that crossing a river or a body of water is required to enter the blessed afterlife. This should not be surprising, however, given the paucity of passages in the Hebrew Scripture that indicate an afterlife is even possible. However, the Hebrew Scripture does use water imagery as part of its description of the eschaton. Thus Isa 33:21 describes the eschaton as a “place of broad rivers and streams” where God is present. And Isa 35:6b–7 offers a common image of water streaming in the desert as a way of speaking about Israel salvation and return from exile: “For waters shall break forth in the wilderness, and streams in the desert; the burning sand shall become a pool, and the thirsty ground springs of water; the haunt of jackals shall become a swamp, the grass shall become reeds and rushes.”

In Second Temple Judaism, the use of water in the afterlife takes a different turn. During this period one begins to find the idea that one must cross a body of water to enter into the afterlife. For example, as quoted above in the context of river of milk and honey, *Sib. Or.* 2.315, describing the righteous entering into the afterlife, states, “angels will lift them through the blazing river and bring them to light and to life without care.” The mention of a “blazing river” is unique to this point in Jewish literature. It is worth noting that the typical sources for apocalyptic

imagery—i.e. the prophets (especially Ezekiel and Daniel) and *1 Enoch*—do not contain any references to a flaming river. Furthermore, the passage from the *Sibylline Oracles* ends with a reference to two Hellenistic places, the Elysian plain and the Acherusian lake. The righteous are said to be placed “with the immortals in the Elysian plain where he has the long waves of the deep perennial Acherusian lake” (2.336–338). Similarly, Josephus connects the afterlife beliefs of the Essenes to the beliefs of the Greeks who “maintain that for virtuous souls there is reserved an abode beyond the ocean” (*J.W.* 2.155). Josephus goes on to liken this place to the island of the blessed.¹⁸⁵ The point here is that, according to Josephus, the Essenes believed that upon death, one’s immortal soul must cross a large body of water before it comes to its final resting place.

The *Sibylline Oracles* and Josephus are not the only Jewish references to such a river or body of water. In what is certainly a later piece of Jewish literature, likely with some Christian interpolation, the *Greek Life of Adam and Eve* describes the death of Adam and states that before entering Paradise, located in the third heaven, “one of the six-winged seraphim came and carried Adam off to the Lake of Acheron and washed him three times in the presence of God” (37.3).¹⁸⁶ The Acherusian Lake, or the Lake of Acheron as it is here called, is a lake located in the realm of Hades according to Greco-Roman mythology. Lake Acheron also makes an appearance in early Christian literature, most notably the *Apocalypse of Paul*, where the archangel Michael washes sinners in this lake prior to entrance into the city of Christ (22).¹⁸⁷

The idea of crossing a blazing river is quite possibly behind the description, some of which is lost, in the *Apocalypse of Zephaniah* in which Zephaniah comes to a “sea of flame,” a place he later learns is Hades (6.1–3, 16). At this point in the narrative, Zephaniah is judged, is found not guilty, and is told he must now “cross over the crossing place” (7.9; 9.2).

¹⁸⁵ Hippolytus has a similar account of the afterlife abode of the Essenes (*Haer.* 9.27.1–3).

¹⁸⁶ Peter-Ben Smit suggests that the reference to Lake Acheron is likely a Christian addition to this text (“Incense Revisited: Reviewing the Evidence for Incense as a Clue to the Christina Provenance of the *Greek Life of Adam and Eve*,” *NovT* 46 [2004]: 375).

¹⁸⁷ For Christian uses of the Acherusian Lake, see especially Kirsti B. Copeland, “Sinners and Post-Mortem ‘Baptism’ in the Acherusian Lake,” in *The Apocalypse of Peter* (ed. J. Bremmer and I. Czachesz; Leuven: Peeters Publishers, 2003), 91–107. Both traditions (river of fire and the Acherusian Lake) are found together in what is likely a much later document, *The Book of the Resurrection of Christ by Barnabas the Apostle*. Here the author notes that those wishing to enter into the blessed afterlife must first cross a flaming river and also be washed three times in the Acherusian lake.

Unfortunately the text is corrupt at this point, and the next extant portion of text has Zephaniah getting out of a boat and entering into a blessed place. The presence of a sea of fire and the need to cross over a body of water (perhaps the sea of fire itself), suggests that the author is likely no longer taking his cues from ancient Jewish tradition but perhaps a more Hellenistic tradition or at the very least a Hellenistic Jewish tradition.¹⁸⁸

3.3.4.3. *Jerusalem's River*

The notion that in the eschaton a river or rivers will flow from Jerusalem, often from the temple itself, is of interest if for no other reason than there are no rivers in Jerusalem.¹⁸⁹ For example, Zechariah writes, "On that day living waters shall flow out from Jerusalem, half of them to the eastern sea and half of them to the western sea; it shall continue in summer as in winter" (Zech 14:8). Similarly, Joel 3:18 states that "a fountain shall come forth from the house of the LORD and water the Wadi Shittim." Also Ezekiel: "Water was flowing from below the threshold of the temple toward the east (for the temple faced east)" (Ezek 47:1). The river in Ezekiel's narrative is described with considerable detail. As one proceeds eastward, the river grows deeper and deeper until finally it is so deep that the visionary is unable to cross it (Ezek 47:3–6). Also, as the river flows eastward, it fills with life all that it touches such that "every living creature that swarms will live, and there will be very many fish, once these waters reach there. It will become fresh; and everything will live where the river goes" (Ezek 47:8b–9). The river will provide fish for all who desire to fish in it. And finally, along the banks of the river will be trees for food that will grow fruit every month, not just in the months that are typical for the harvest. Ezekiel says that all of these supernatural occurrences happen because the river "flows from the sanctuary" (47:12).¹⁹⁰

¹⁸⁸ 3 *Baruch* also requires the crossing of a river, this time for the purpose of entering the heavens. Baruch sets out on a journey that begins with crossing a river "which no one is able to cross, not even one of the foreign winds which God created" (2.1; cf. 10.1–10). The separation of the heavens and the earths with a body of water seems to fit the context of the passages mentioned here.

¹⁸⁹ Ira Sharkansky writes: "There are no rivers or lakes in the vicinity. One major spring was located just outside of David's city and was the subject of ancient engineering to bring its waters inside the city walls for access during siege. Over the years, this and other sources were supplemented by pools and cisterns to store rainwater, aqueducts from sources near Hebron, and carriers who hauled water by cart, animal, or human pack from other springs" (*Governing Jerusalem: Again on the World's Agenda* [Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1996], 46). Cf. Hoppe, *The Holy City*, 27–29.

¹⁹⁰ See also Ps 46:4.

Rivers in Jerusalem can also be found in the literature from the Second Temple period. For example, a river flowing from under the temple in Jerusalem is present in the *Book of Watchers'* description of the future Jerusalem, a place of eschatological blessing (1 *En.* 26–27), and *Odes Sol.* 6.8 reverses the flow of the river so that it leads not away from the temple but into it.

For the biblical authors as well as those in the Second Temple period, the imagery of a river going to or from the temple served as a way of imagining the life-giving nature of the eschaton, the source of which was the temple.

3.3.5. *Wine*

Wine makes its way into utopian descriptions through two primary avenues: to a lesser degree, in the form of rivers of wine (as seen above in *Sib. Or.* 2:318; 2 *En.* 8.5) and, more often, in the notion of an abundance of wine.¹⁹¹ Having addressed the former in the previous section, it is the latter that here needs attention.

Before addressing an expectation of an abundance of wine, it should first be noted that, on the whole, the Hebrew Scripture repeatedly casts wine as a good in the world.¹⁹² Thus, in a quasi-Edenic description of the earth, the psalmist writes:

You make springs gush forth in the valleys; they flow between the hills, giving drink to every wild animal; the wild asses quench their thirst. By the streams the birds of the air have their habitation; they sing among the branches. From your lofty abode you water the mountains; the earth is satisfied with the fruit of your work. You cause the grass to grow for the cattle, and plants for people to use, to bring forth food from the earth, and *wine to gladden the human heart*, oil to make the face shine, and bread to strengthen the human heart. The trees of the LORD are watered abundantly, the cedars of Lebanon that he planted. (Ps 104:10–16)

¹⁹¹ See Baumgarten, “4Q500 and the Ancient Conception of the Lord’s Vineyard,” 1–6. Baumgarten sifts through the complex traditions that link rivers, wine, Jerusalem, and the garden of Eden. For wine in general in ancient Judaism, see Carey Ellen Walsh, *The Fruit of the Vine: Viticulture in Ancient Israel* (HSM 60; Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2000), 209–58; Magen Broshi, “Wine in Ancient Palestine: Introductory Notes,” in *Bread, Wine, Walls and Scrolls* (JSPSup 36; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 2001), 144–73.

¹⁹² Though found rarely, wine does not always receive praise in the Hebrew Scripture. Proverbs 20:1 states that wine and strong drinker leads to mocking and brawling. In Prov 21:17, lovers of wine are said not to be rich. See also Prov 23:29–31; 31:4; Jer 13:12.

This passage is a locative-temporal utopia with pastoral imagery. Along with springs, hills, wild animals, trees, and all manner of food, the author inserts that wine is given for the purpose of making the heart glad.¹⁹³

Regarding an abundance of wine, the psalmist, for example, uses this as a point of comparison for how great is the joy of the Lord: "You have put gladness in my heart more than when their grain and wine abound" (Ps 4:7). An abundance of wine, then, is used as a standard by which gladness can be measured. In Proverbs, one of the results of right living, including giving one's first fruits to the Lord, is that "your barns will be filled with plenty, and your vats will be bursting with wine" (Prov 3:10). Isaiah 55:1 describes a utopian future in which one will have free access not only to water and food but to wine and milk as well. Jeremiah describes a ransomed Israel with the utopian *topos* of abundance, both of food and wine: "They shall come and sing aloud on the height of Zion, and they shall be radiant over the goodness of the LORD, over the grain, the wine, and the oil, and over the young of the flock and the herd; their life shall become like a watered garden, and they shall never languish again" (Jer 31:12; cf. 40:12).¹⁹⁴

In Second Temple Judaism wine shows up as an expression of just how blessed the blessed afterlife will be.¹⁹⁵ The three examples that follow do this by emphasizing the vast abundance of wine in the afterlife. 1 *Enoch* 10.19, describing the earth after the time of judgment in the new creation, states that: "They will plant vines on it, and every vine that will be planted on it will yield a thousand jugs of wine." *Second Baruch* 29.5 amplifies this tradition exponentially: "And on one vine will be a thousand branches, and one branch will produce a thousand clusters, and one cluster will produce a thousand grapes, and one grape will produce a cor of wine."¹⁹⁶ Finally, *Sib. Or.* 3.745 states that there will be unlimited amounts of wine in the blessed life to come.

In 3 *Baruch*, wine enters the garden of Eden narrative in a way that is different from other depictions of wine mentioned to this point. The author wishes to cause his reader to pause and question the fundamental nature of wine. In this narrative, the tree of the knowledge of good and

¹⁹³ See also Hos 14:7 where wine is related to an Edenic scene in which God relents and makes Israel to thrive like the forests of Lebanon.

¹⁹⁴ For other expressions of an abundance of wine in the eschaton, see Isa 25:6; 61:5; Jer 31:5; Joel 2:19–24; Amos 9:13–14; Mic 4:4; Zech 8:12.

¹⁹⁵ In a locative-temporal utopian description, the *Letter of Aristeas* mentions abundant vines in the present (112).

¹⁹⁶ Similar descriptions of vast clusters of grapes show up in Christian traditions as well. See *Apoc. Paul* 22 and Papias, according to Irenaeus, *Haer.* 5.33.3.

evil is not a tree but a vine, the fruit of which is undoubtedly wine. *Third Baruch* 4.10–17 uses the symbol of the fruit of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil to give a moral exhortation concerning the dangers of wine. God tells Noah, who finds a sprig of the vine after the Flood, that he should plant the vine, but he should know that it still contains some of the evil that caused the fall of humanity.¹⁹⁷ The purpose, then, seems to be to inform the reader that while wine is indeed a good and wonderful thing given to the earth and even present in the garden itself, one should be careful. This idea, which can be understood as a call for moderation, has a place in Jewish tradition.¹⁹⁸

In conclusion, the Hebrew Scripture as whole, with few exceptions, has a high regard for the place of wine in everyday life. When it comes to utopian expectations in both biblical and Second Temple literature, therefore, it should come as no surprise that wine is present in abundance, for as the author of Sirach writes: “What is life to one who is without wine? It has been created to make people happy” (31:27).

3.3.6. Food

In what is the most recent and thorough monograph on the role of food in utopia, Peter-Ben Smit distinguishes between eschatology and utopianism, a distinction that is much appreciated.¹⁹⁹ In selecting the texts from which he draws his information about Jewish tradition, he categorizes the literature into “eschatological banquets” and “utopian abundance,” the

¹⁹⁷ The fruit of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil in the *Apocalypse of Abraham* is also grapes of the vine, likely hinting at the dangers of wine though this is not explicitly stated as with *3 Baruch* (*Apoc. Ab.* 23.6). Cf. *1 En.* 32.4.

¹⁹⁸ Two notable examples are Philo (*On Drunkenness* and *On Sobriety*) and Sirach, the latter of which states: “Wine is very life to human beings if taken in moderation. What is life to one who is without wine? It has been created to make people happy. Wine drunk at the proper time and in moderation is rejoicing of heart and gladness of soul. Wine drunk to excess leads to bitterness of spirit, to quarrels and stumbling. Drunkenness increases the anger of a fool to his own hurt, reducing his strength and adding wounds” (31:27–30).

¹⁹⁹ As does the present study, Smit perceives of utopianism as an overarching category that contains eschatology but is not contained by it. He writes that there are three dimensions to ancient utopianism (a term that he unfortunately uses interchangeably with “the Golden Age,” which accounts for only a part of utopianism): “a protological dimension, a futuristic dimension and a geographical dimension” (Smit, *Fellowship and Food*, 17; cf. Reinhold Bichler, *Von der Insel der Seligen zu Platons Staat: Gischichte der antiken Utopie I* [Alltag und Kultur im Altertum 3; Vienna: Böhlau, 1995]). He then adds a fourth dimension, which he calls post-mortal hopes of paradisiac circumstances. He does not sufficiently clarify how this fourth category differs from his “futuristic dimension” and would have been better off subsuming the former into the latter. Nevertheless, he is right when he notes that “the eschatological is therefore only one dimension of the utopian” (18).

latter of which contains both nutritional abundance and what he calls the “food of Eden,” such as the tree of life. What follows will proceed similarly to Smit, beginning with eschatological banquets and moving to utopian abundance; instead of keeping Edenic food as part of utopian abundance, however, this *topos* will conclude with a separate section on food found in Eden.

3.3.6.1. *Eschatological Banquets*

Smit notes that it was Albert Schweitzer who “avidly promoted the theme of the eschatological banquet,”²⁰⁰ a theme that has often been taken for granted among biblical scholars, and one that Smit tries to speak to with more precision.²⁰¹ That the Hebrew Scripture contains only one example of a celebratory feast as an eschatological banquet suggests more clarity is indeed necessary.²⁰² Isaiah 25:6–8 states:

On this mountain the LORD of hosts will make for all peoples a feast of rich food, a feast of well-aged wines, of rich food filled with marrow, of well-aged wines strained clear. And he will destroy on this mountain the shroud that is cast over all peoples, the sheet that is spread over all nations; he will swallow up death forever. Then the Lord GOD will wipe away the tears from all faces, and the disgrace of his people he will take away from all the earth, for the LORD has spoken.

Here is described a rich feast with food and wine. That this banquet is an eschatological context is made clear by the mention of the death of

²⁰⁰ Smit, *Fellowship and Food*, 2. Cf. Albert Schweitzer, *The Quest of Historical Jesus* (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1906; repr., Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 2001); idem, *The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle* (London: Black, 1931; repr., Johns Hopkins University Press, 1998). The eschatological banquet is often referred to with the less precise phrase, “Messianic banquet.”

²⁰¹ For other helpful essays, see John Priest, “A Note on the Messianic Banquet,” in *The Messiah* (ed. J. Charlesworth; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992), 222–38; Dennis Smith, “The Messianic Banquet Reconsidered,” in *The Future of Early Christianity* (ed. B. Pearson, T. Kraabel, G. Nickelsburg; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991), 64–73. Smith also notes the lack of “systematic analysis” of this topic and cites the following standard treatments of it (“The Messianic Banquet Reconsidered,” 64): George F. Moore, *Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era: The Age of the Tannaim* (3 vols.; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1927–1930), 2:364–65; Joachim Jeremias, *Jesus’ Promise to the Nations* (tr. S. H. Hooke; London: SCM Press, 1958), 59–65; Frank Moore Cross, jr., *The Ancient Library of Qumran* (3d ed.; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995), 74–78, 168–70.

²⁰² See Smit, *Fellowship and Food*, 22. He cites a number of studies that corroborate this claim. Priest (“A Note on the Messianic Banquet”) gives the following as examples of an eschatological meal, but none of them are clearly a banquet setting and some do not even contain food: Isa 49:9–12; 55; 65:13–16; Ezek 34:11–31; Zeph 3:8–13; Zech 9:9–17.

death.²⁰³ Outside of Isaiah 25, however, eschatological feasts are nowhere to be found in the Hebrew Scripture (though the New Testament is certainly rife with examples).

Moving to the Second Temple period, given the apocalyptic eschatology prevalent in this period, one might expect the eschatological banquet to show up liberally in its literature; instead, one finds very few references to the eschatological banquet. Combining the primary sources referenced in Priest and Smit, one arrives at the following list of references to the eschatological banquet in Second Temple Jewish literature: 1QS^a II, 11–22; 1 *En.* 62.14; 2 *En.* 42.5; 3 *En.* 48.10; 4 *Ezra* 2:38; 2 *Bar.* 29.1–8; *T. Isaac* 6.22; 8.11; *T. Sim.* 6.7; *T. Jac.* 7.21–28; *T. Ab.* 20.14.²⁰⁴ There are, however, considerable problems with most of these examples. Each needs to be addressed accordingly.

3 *Enoch*, the *Testament of Isaac*, and the *Testament of Jacob* are all relatively late documents and their influence on and reflection of Second Temple Judaism is marginal rather than central, and so their role in reconstructing Jewish perspectives in the Second Temple period should reflect this marginal nature.²⁰⁵ 4 *Ezra* 2:38 is problematic because chapter 2 of 4 *Ezra* is part of the later Christian additions to 4 *Ezra*, and, given the fact that Christianity developed the eschatological banquet to a higher degree than did other Jewish sects, the evidence of 4 *Ezra* 2 is problematic. The *Testament of Simeon* 6.7 suffers from a similar problem in that this passage is without doubt a Christian interpolation (“God has taken a body, eats with human beings, and saves human beings”). The *Testament of Abraham* 20.14, even if it was written during the Second Temple period, is a strange addition to this list because it has no food in view. Abraham is simply said to ascend to Paradise where there are tents for the righteous and mansions for the holy ones, a place without pain and strife. No word, however, is mentioned about food or banquets.

²⁰³ Isaiah 25 is unique in the Hebrew Scripture in that it carries apocalyptic overtones to a degree not found anywhere but the book of Daniel. As Aune notes, “The ultimate annihilation of death is an apocalyptic theme (Isa 25:8; 4 *Ezra* 8:53; 2 *Apoc. Bar.* 21:23; *Bib. Ant.* 3:10; 33:3)” (David E. Aune, *Revelation 17–22* [WBC 52c; Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 1998], 1125).

²⁰⁴ Smit does give the caveat that references to non-canonical literature are representative rather than exhaustive, but one should assume that he has, at the very least, put forth the more important primary sources (Smit, *Fellowship and Food*, 22 n. 149). See Priest, “A Note on the Messianic Banquet.”

²⁰⁵ Note that though this chapter occasionally appeals to 3 *Enoch* (a work that clearly post-dates 200 CE), it is used for footnoting later developments of traditions that have earlier precedent.

Both Smit and Priest incorrectly mention 2 *En.* 42.5 as a reference to an eschatological banquet. This text, which begins with the phrase “just as a friend invites . . .”, is using the joy experienced at earthly banquets as a point of comparison with the joy that will be in the eschaton. This passage is using banquets as a point of comparison. The text is about joy, not banquets, in the eschaton.

After sorting through the list of texts that might suggest an eschatological banquet, only three remain: 1QSa II, 11–22; 1 *En.* 62.14; and 2 *Bar.* 29.1–8. The *Rule of the Congregation* (1QSa) contains the clearest example of an eschatological banquet. Here is described the order of table matters once the Messiah arrives. That the Messiah eats bread and wine with the group and in turn blesses the group certainly constitutes a messianic or eschatological banquet.²⁰⁶ The example from Qumran is the clearest of any example for eschatological banquets in Second Temple Judaism.

The accounts of 1 *En.* 62.14 and 2 *Bar.* 29.1–8 are less obvious and require some background. Dennis Smith argues that these texts both employ “combat and victory motifs,” which include a traditional post-battle celebration and banquet.²⁰⁷ It is only through the lens of the combat and victory motif that the eschatological banquet becomes visible in both 1 *Enoch* 62 and 2 *Baruch* 29. Starting with 1 *Enoch*:

[The righteous] will rejoice over [the kings, the governors, the high officials, and the landlords] because the wrath of the Lord of the Spirits rests upon them, and his sword is drunk with them. And the righteous and the chosen will be saved on that day; and the faces of the sinners and the unrighteous they will henceforth not see. And the Lord of Spirits will abide over them, and with that son of man they will eat, and they will lie down and rise up forever and ever. (62.12–14)

The “combat” part of this passage comes in the form of the Lord’s wrath upon the unrighteous and the fact that “his sword is drunk with them,” a phrase that one should understand as “drunk with their blood” (e.g. Deut 32:42), i.e. it is the divine warrior who slays the unrighteous. After the battle and the subsequent victory, the text states that the righteous will then eat with the son of man. The “banqueting” nature of this eating is not explicit in the text, and in order to find it one must fill in the gaps with the combat and victory motif as stated by Smith. The result is that

²⁰⁶ See Smith, “The Messianic Banquet Reconsidered,” 71.

²⁰⁷ Smith, “Messianic Banquet,” *ABD* 4:789.

while an eschatological banquet *may* be in view here, one must put on a certain lens (i.e. the combat and victory motif) to see it clearly.

Second Baruch 29 requires similar massaging to *1 Enoch* 62. The text describes an eschatological situation at which time the Messiah is revealed along with Behemoth and Leviathan, two great ancient monsters that the text explains were created on the fifth day. At this point, the text is terse and simply states that these two beings “will be nourishment for all who are left” (29.4) and then proceeds to describe an earth that provides food with miraculous fecundity. Strangely, we are not told how Leviathan and Behemoth die, and no battle is described between the Messiah and these creatures. Despite these lacunae, Smith, once again reading in light of the combat and victory motif, finds here another example of an eschatological banquet, one that consists of the remains of Behemoth and Leviathan as well as the abundance of food and wine mentioned in the verse that follows.²⁰⁸ Isaiah 25 this is not, but it is nevertheless a possible example of an eschatological banquet.

The results of a search for eschatological banquets in Second Temple Judaism, then, are surprisingly slim. The messianic or eschatological banquet, a tradition that many scholars affirm without much thought, is only found clearly in Isa. 25:6–8, *1QSa* II, 11–22, and less explicitly in *2 Bar.* 29.1–11 and *1 En.* 62.12–14. The New Testament picks up this motif with a vigor (especially in the gospels and Revelation), but any other Jewish references to an eschatological banquet are either from a later date or are a later Christian interpolation.²⁰⁹

²⁰⁸ Smith, “Messianic Banquet,” *ABD* 4.789; idem, “The Messianic Banquet Reconsidered,” 68.

²⁰⁹ The best and most recent study on eschatological meals in the New Testament is without doubt Peter-Ben Smit, *Fellowship and Food in the Kingdom*. His conclusions regarding the eschatological banquet are illuminating. He rejects the idea that the authors of the NT appealed to a specific paradigm from the Hebrew Scripture as a way of talking about the nature of the eschaton. He writes: “The suggestion of a specific HB/OT paradigm for the eschatological banquet in the NT in general, e.g. Isa. 25:6–8, for eschatological meals in the NT was rejected. Despite obvious thematic similarities, for none of the eschatological *banquets* this particular text, or any other, could with any degree of probability be pinpointed as its source of inspiration. . . . Therefore, solution to this tradition-historical aporia cannot lie in replacing Isa. 25:6–8 with another text” (379–80; emphasis his; it should be stressed that a “replacement” cannot be found *outside* of the Hebrew Scripture either). He argues, then, that the New Testament’s use of the eschatological banquet can ultimately be traced back to the preaching of the historical Jesus and his “meal praxis” as understood in a broader Mediterranean context (381).

3.3.6.2. *Utopian Abundance*

It should come as no surprise that during age and in a place where famine, flood, and loss of a harvest could cripple a society, utopia included a life in which these worries are absent and are in fact reversed so that an abundance of food is commonplace. Utopian descriptions in the Hebrew Scripture in which the land is filled with an abundance of food are manifold.²¹⁰ And though abundance is primarily an expectation in the eschaton, it can also be found in nationalistic utopianism.²¹¹ That the land produces an abundance of food is fitting not only because food should be plentiful in utopia but also because of the importance the Hebrew Scripture places on the “land” as a promise and pledge from God himself. Thus the land itself is often described in idyllic terms, as one finds in Deut 8:7–10:

For the LORD your God is bringing you into a good land, a land with flowing streams, with springs and underground waters welling up in valleys and hills, a land of wheat and barley, of vines and fig trees and pomegranates, a land of olive trees and honey, a land where you may eat bread without scarcity, where you will lack nothing, a land whose stones are iron and from whose hills you may mine copper. You shall eat your fill and bless the LORD your God for the good land that he has given you.²¹²

Three chapters later is another striking example of a description, mythical in proportion, of the locative-temporal utopia of the promised land:

For the land that you are about to enter to occupy is not like the land of Egypt, from which you have come, where you sow your seed and irrigate by foot like a vegetable garden. But the land that you are crossing over to occupy is a land of hills and valleys, watered by rain from the sky, a land that the LORD your God looks after. The eyes of the LORD your God are always on it, from the beginning of the year to the end of the year. If you will only heed his every commandment that I am commanding you today—loving

²¹⁰ For a representative sample of an abundance of food in utopia see Exod 16:1–34; 23:25; Num 11:31–32; 13:23; Lev 25:20–21; 26:10; Ps 22:27; 72:16; 78:23–29; 105:40; 1 Chr 12:40; Neh 9:25; Job 36:31; Isa. 1:19; 9:3; 25:6; 27:2–6, 12–13; 33:16; 51:3; 55:1–2; 60:4–14; Jer 31:12; Ezek 34:25–31; 36:29–30; Joel 2:18–27; 4:18; Amos 9:13–14; Mic 4:4; Zech 9:17; 4 *Ezra* 7.123; Philo, *Praem.* 100–101. See also *Sib. Or.* 5.281 which describes a utopian vision of the land of Israel in which the earth is being destroyed, but meanwhile, the holy land of Israel continues to be productive bearing abundant crops in the midst of this oppressive time.

²¹¹ Utopian abundance in Eden is rarely explicitly mentioned (though it is perhaps implied). Philo, however, states outright that prior to the fall, Eden was marked by utopian abundance “unaided by the skill of agricultural labourers.” After the judgment of Adam and Eve, however, God no longer supplied the human race “with food ready to its hand” (*Opif.* 168–169 [Colson and Whitaker, LCL]; cf. *QG* 1.9).

²¹² For similar examples of abundance in the promised land see Deut 11:10–12; Num 13:23.

the LORD your God, and serving him with all your heart and with all your soul—then he will give the rain for your land in its season, the early rain and the later rain, and you will gather in your grain, your wine, and your oil; and he will give grass in your fields for your livestock, and you will eat your fill. (Deut 11:10–15)

The author uses Egypt—a notoriously fertile location—as a point of comparison to show just how fertile the promised land is. There is one catch, however: the fertility of the land is entirely dependent upon the rain sent from God, giving God considerable leverage over the inhabitants of the land. It is a fertile land . . . so long as one keeps covenant with God.

Another example of a nationalistic utopian description is the dedication of the temple as told in 1 Kings and 2 Chronicles.²¹³ An abundance of food is part of the dedication because of the sacrifice of well-being. Upon dedicating the temple, Solomon offered sacrifices of well-being on behalf of “all the people of Israel” of an exorbitant number: twenty-two thousand oxen and one hundred twenty thousand sheep (1 Kgs 8:63; 2 Chr 7:5).²¹⁴ This sacrificial act is linked to an abundance of food because accompanied with the sacrifice of well-being is the expectation that the animal sacrificed is to be eaten as part of a feast (Lev 19:5–8; 22:29–30). Thus, through the enormous number of sacrifices of well-being at the temple’s dedication, feasting and an abundance of food is contained within the narrative.

The *Letter of Aristeas* also describes the land in terms of a locative-temporal utopia. The author states that, when taken care of properly through careful attention to husbandry, the land yields an abundance of food: “In fact their land is thickly covered with large numbers of olive trees and corn crops and pulse, and moreover with vines and abundant honey. As for the fruit trees and date palms which they have, no number can be given. They have many flocks and herds of various kinds, with ample pasture for them.” (*Let. Aris.* 112). Here, all manner of foods are present in abundance, along with wine too.

²¹³ Aside from the dedication described below, some scholars have argued that the engravings of trees placed throughout the temple is meant to convey God’s abundant provision (1 Kgs 6:29–35; cf. Smit, *Fellowship and Food*, 362).

²¹⁴ Compare these numbers to the more modest ones of Ezra 6:17 at the rededication of the temple: one hundred bulls, two hundred rams, and four hundred lambs. Eusebius (*Praep. ev.* 9.34.1–16) retells the dedication of the Solomonic temple but gives more reasonable numbers for the offering: a thousand oxen, two thousand sheep, and three thousand five hundred calves. Despite calling it “immense,” it is nowhere near the numbers found in 1 Kings. Josephus, on the other hand, confirms the numbers in 1 Kings (*Ant.* 8.122).

Philo's and Josephus' descriptions of the utopian community of the Essenes contains an element that could be read as utopian abundance with a twist. The twist is that abundance does not come from a surplus of foodstuffs or natural fecundity. The abundance of food for the Essenes arises from the communistic society within which they live, a society that provides plenty of food for all members of the community such that their food is "abundantly sufficient" (Josephus, *J.W.* 2.133; cf. 2.127–131; Philo, *Prob.* 86, 91; *Hypoth.* 11.5). Abundance of food for the Essenes, therefore, mirrors the Greco-Roman political utopianism more than a miraculous fecundity found in both Greco-Roman and Jewish traditions.

Amos 9:13 is classic example of utopian abundance in the eschaton: "The time is surely coming, says the LORD, when the one who plows shall overtake the one who reaps, and the treader of grapes the one who sows the seed." This passage demonstrates the expectation of an abundance of both food and wine in the eschaton. Cornelius explains that Amos is here describing two seasons of the year, the season for harvest and the season for grapes, both of which are so abundant that the seasons bleed into one another. "There is an abundance of harvest—the harvest (April–May) will not be completed when the plowers (Oct) are ready! The pressing of the grapes will not be finished (Aug–Sept) when they start to sow (Oct–Nov)."²¹⁵ Ezekiel goes one step further describing a river that flows from the temple in the new Jerusalem on the banks of which grow trees that produce fruit every month of the year. In this utopia, seasons no longer govern the production of fruit, and sustenance will be provided year round without worry of famine (Ezek 47:12; cf. 34:26–29; 36:29–30). Abundance, then, appears in both eschatological utopias and nationalistic utopias.

According to Second Temple literature, the eschaton was also expected to contain food in abundance and often showing up spontaneously.²¹⁶ Even from a relatively early period one finds traditions about natural fecundity in the afterlife. For example, 1 *Enoch* 10.19 says: "And of every seed that is sown on [the earth], each measure will yield a thousand measures, and

²¹⁵ Cornelius, "Paradise Motifs," 49. While Amos 9 is certainly eschatological, the same language and imagery is used in Leviticus 26 to convey a legal-covenantal utopia: "If you follow my statutes and keep my commandments and observe them faithfully... your threshing shall overtake the vintage, and the vintage shall overtake the sowing; you shall eat your bread to the full, and live securely in your land" (26:3, 5). Philo echoes Leviticus and also employs the *topos* of utopian abundance for those who keep God's statutes (*Praem.* 101).

²¹⁶ For other examples not mentioned below see 4 *Ezra* 6.44; *Sib. Or.* 2.320–321; 3.619–623.

each measure of olives will yield ten baths of oil." The expectation of ample food in the afterlife is also found in the *Sibylline Oracles*: "For the all-bearing earth will give the most excellent unlimited fruit to mortals, of grain, wine, and oil and a delightful drink of sweet honey from heaven, trees, fruit of the top branches, and rich flocks and herds and lambs of sheep and kids of goats. . . . The cities will be full of good things and the fields will be rich" (3.744–748, 750–751).

A similar description of food in abundance can be found in *2 Baruch*, which perhaps echoes *1 Enoch* 10. Though the author is not writing about the final eschatological utopia, he is writing about a future messianic period that precedes the eschaton and the final resurrection: "The earth will also yield fruits ten thousandfold. . . . And those who are hungry will enjoy themselves and they will, moreover, see marvels every day. . . . And it will happen at that time that the treasury of manna will come down again from on high, and they will eat of it in those years because these are they who will have arrived at the consummation of time" (29.5–6, 8).²¹⁷ A miraculous manna, food from God above, will be food for those in the messianic era.

3.3.6.3. *The Food of Eden and The Two Trees*²¹⁸

In the narrative of the garden of Eden found in Genesis 2–3 there are two important trees: the tree of life and the tree of the knowledge of good and evil.²¹⁹ What is not at all obvious is how these trees function in later

²¹⁷ See also *2 Bar.* 74.1, "And it will happen in those days that the reapers will not become tired, and the farmers will not wear themselves out, because the products of themselves will shoot out speedily, during the time that they work on them in full tranquility."

²¹⁸ This section is focused entirely on the tradition of the trees of Eden. However, there is a unique story contained within the opening chapters of the *Vita* worth mentioning. Here, Adam and Eve have just been removed from the garden of Eden and they become hungry after seven days of mourning. Fearing they are going to die, they begin a search for food, even petitioning God to allow them food from the garden. The result of the search is the recognition that where they once ate "the food of angels," they now are only given food that was once only "for animals and beasts to eat" (*Vita* 4.2). The author of the *Vita* uses food as the first example of how life is different outside of Eden.

²¹⁹ For excellent treatments of trees in paradise, see Veronika Bachmann, "Rooted in Paradise? The Meaning of the 'Tree of Life' in *1 Enoch* 24–25 Reconsidered," *JSP* 19 (2009): 83–107; Lanfer, "Allusion to and Expansion of the Tree of Life," 96–108; Menahem, "The Tree of Life and the Turning Sword: Jewish Biblical Interpretation, Symbols, and Theological Patterns and Their Christian Counterparts," in *Paradise in Antiquity: Jewish and Christian Views* (ed. M. Bockmuehl and G. Stroumsa; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), 138–55; Maren R. Niehoff, "Questions and Answers in Philo and Genesis Rabbah," *JSJ* 39 (2008): 337–66; Otzen, "The Paradise Trees in Jewish Apocalyptic," 140–54; Tigchelaar, "Eden and Paradise," 37–62.

Jewish tradition where they generate considerable interest and take on their own personas, so much so that expansions and elaborations on the trees of Eden are more popular than that of both Eve and the serpent, perhaps even rivaling interest in the character of Adam.²²⁰ Otzen has rightly argued that the two Edenic trees function primarily in two ways. The tree of knowledge is typically found in retrospective depictions of the Eden of Genesis, and the tree of life functions as a sign of the eschaton, a tree for future generations to enjoy and behold for eternity.²²¹

Except for a few references to the tree of life in Proverbs, the Hebrew Scripture does not mention either tree outside of the book of Genesis.²²² Second Temple literature, however, is full of references to the trees. Interestingly, earlier literature tends to keep the traditions of the individual trees separate, often referring to one tree without mentioning the other. *Jubilees* is a good example.

Jubilees, in its retelling of the Eden narrative, tells not of two trees but of one, the tree from which Adam and Eve were not supposed to eat, i.e. the tree of knowledge. Conspicuously missing from the *Jubilees* narrative

²²⁰ Lanfer even states that “the characters of Adam and Eve essentially disappear from view” in the Second Temple period. Lanfer, however, overstates his case since this does not do justice to the literature of Adam and Eve nor the place of Adam in traditions about the origins of sin and the future glory of the human race (see, e.g., Zemler-Cizewski, “The Apocryphal Life of Adam and Eve”; Stone, *Ancient Judaism*, 32, 52–58).

²²¹ If not eternity, they at least enjoy it for an abnormally long life. Otzen, “The Paradise Trees in Jewish Apocalyptic,” 141. One tradition concerning the tree of life that is not future oriented, known by both Philo (*Migr.* 36–37) and Pseudo-Philo (*L.A.B.* 11.15), is that Moses throws a branch from the tree of life into the waters of Marah to turn the waters from bitter to sweet. 2 *Baruch* 59.3–11 similarly states that Moses gained access to the secrets of heaven while on Sinai, even access to paradise (cf. *L.A.B.* 13.8–9). See Bauckham, “Paradise in the *Biblical Antiquities* of Pseudo-Philo,” 55.

²²² Prov 3:18; 11:30; 13:12; 15:4. In each case, the tree of life is divorced from the larger Eden narrative as told in Genesis 2–3. Proverbs consistently uses the tree of life in a symbolic way to encourage a certain character trait; this is to be differentiated from its usage in apocalyptic texts as a means of speaking about the blessed afterlife. For example, Prov. 15:4, “A gentle tongue is a tree of life, but perverseness in it breaks the spirit.” Also, the LXX translation of Isa 65:22 uses the phrase tree of life in a way that alters the MT slightly and uniquely.

Interestingly, Ezek 31:3–9 compares the cedars of Lebanon with the trees of the garden of Eden. The passage, however, entirely fails to mention either of the two major trees that take center stage in the Genesis narrative. That the author is able to mention the “cedars of the garden of God” and the “trees of Eden” without referencing the tree of knowledge or the tree of life combined with the fact that neither tree is mentioned outside of Genesis (with the notable exception of Proverbs) should cause one to pause over the lack of influence these two trees had in biblical literature—especially when compared to their influence in Second Temple literature. Furthermore, Ezekiel 31 has a fascinating statement that the trees of Eden were taken down to Sheol (31:16–18).

is the tree of life.²²³ *Jubilees* is rewritten Scripture and gives the most complete re-written version of the Eden narrative. As an example of a retrospective perspective on the garden, *Jubilees* mentions the tree of knowledge as the tree from which Adam and Eve ate. Not present, however, is the tree of life, a point that has led some scholars to question whether the author of *Jubilees* was even aware of this tree, and more importantly, whether the tree of life and the tree of knowledge were cemented together in the biblical narrative at this stage.²²⁴

The *Book of Watchers* (1 *Enoch* 1–36) is an interesting case because of conflicting scholarly opinion on whether or not both trees are present in this document. In the *Book of Watchers*, scholars have traditionally found two references to Eden, one in chs. 24–25 and another in ch. 32; the first refers to the tree of life and the second to the tree of knowledge.²²⁵ The traditional view stems primarily from Grelot's oft-cited article concerning how the trees come to rest where they do in 1 *Enoch*.²²⁶ Grelot argues that ch. 32 describes the Eden from Genesis 2–3, which is located in the east, a place that is presently empty save for the tree of knowledge. Grelot asserts that after the fall, the tree of life was uprooted from the eastern Eden and transplanted to a heavenly Eden that is described in chs. 24–25 and is located in the northwest, a place where God dwells and where the tree of life presently sits. In the eschaton after the great judgment, God will once again transplant the tree of life, this time moving it to Jerusalem

²²³ This can be contrasted with Josephus' retelling in which he strays little from the final form of text as we have it today, mentioning both trees and highlighting the role of the tree of knowledge (*Ant.* 1.37–51).

²²⁴ See Tigchelaar, "Eden and Paradise," 47.

²²⁵ Veronika Bachmann has recently called this traditional reading into question ("Rooted in Paradise?," 83–107). She argues that reading the tree of life into chapter 24–25 poses more problems than it solves and suggests that Genesis' tree of life is not in view here, wisdom is. She says that if one wishes to hold onto the language of the tree of life, it should be that found in Proverbs, which is disconnected from the Genesis narrative and associated with wisdom. The *Psalms of Solomon* also uses the tree of life in a similar manner, speaking not of a single tree but of *trees* of life: "The Lord's paradise, the trees of life, are his devout ones" (14.3). In essence the author of this passage locates Eden within humanity rather than in a specific earthly or heavenly location. The "devout" ones are known by their righteousness and inherit the pleasures of paradise, a life of happiness (14.10). The similarities in the use of the tree of life between the *Psalms of Solomon* and Proverbs are clear. For example, in Proverbs the tree of life becomes a symbol for righteous living: "The fruit of the righteous is a tree of life" (Prov 11:30; cf. 3:18; 13:12; 15:4).

²²⁶ Pierre Grelot, "La géographie mythique d'Hénoch et ses sources orientales," *RB* 65 (1958): 33–69.

where future generations will enjoy life eternal.²²⁷ In short, Grelot posits that the tree of life was once planted in the eastern Eden, moved to the northwestern Eden where it presently sits, and will one day be moved again to Jerusalem.

1 Enoch 32 is without doubt a description of the Eden from Genesis 2–3. Here Enoch is on a grand tour of the cosmos and finds himself in the east in what is called the garden of righteousness. This garden, in the midst of seven mountains populated with sweet-smelling trees, holds one special tree, the “tree of wisdom,” which is a clear reference to the tree of knowledge from Genesis 2–3 because the author connects it to the fall of Adam and Eve.²²⁸ Further, the eastern location comports with Gen 2:8 in which Eden is said to be planted in the east. This Eden, then, is a retrospective Eden that has existed since creation; it is not a place to be inhabited by future generations, and it houses only one tree: the tree of knowledge.

Moving to chs. 24–25, however, Grelot’s version of the Enochic narrative, popular among scholars, has come under considerable critique in recent years.²²⁹ The similarities between the locales of chs. 24–25 and ch. 32 have led many scholars to read the northwestern site as another Eden and to understand this place’s tree as the tree of life. The reasons for the comparison are because both passages describe a mountainous region with many sweet-smelling trees and both emphasize one tree in particular

²²⁷ This narrative has been followed by much of scholarship (e.g. Himmelfarb, “The Temple and the Garden of Eden,” 70; Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch* 1, 312–30; Lanfer, “Tree of Life,” 102–103).

²²⁸ The tree’s fruit is described as being “like the clusters of the vine” (*1 En.* 32.4), a point that later interpreters seize upon and elaborate. Both the *Apocalypse of Abraham* (23.6) and *3 Baruch* (3.10–17) state that the tree of knowledge is not actually a tree at all but a vine. The fruit of the tree is grapes (or wine). According to *3 Baruch*, during the Flood the water rose 15 cubits, entered paradise and killed every flower in it. The only thing that somehow escaped was a sprig of the vine of the knowledge of good and evil. Noah finds the vine and recognizes that it is the fruit that caused the fall of Adam and Eve and asks God what he should do with it. At this point, the Greek text complicates matters because it is thoroughly infused with Christian imagery. The Slavonic text, on the hand, appears to preserve an earlier version. In it, God responds to Noah telling him to plant the vine, alter its name, and “change it for the better” (4.15). But the Lord immediately offers a warning stating that the plant still possesses its evil; this is followed by a list of evils that result from drinking wine in excess. For *3 Baruch*, then, the fruit of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil is something to which all have access even today, something that can cause great joy and great evil: wine.

²²⁹ Three notable exceptions are Tigchelaar (“Eden and Paradise,” 37–62), Bautch (*A Study of the Geography of 1 Enoch 17–19: “No One Has Seen What I Have Seen,”* [Leiden: Brill, 2003], 160–76) and Bachmann (“Rooted in Paradise?,” 83–107), all of whom question Grelot’s narrative and the association of the tree mentioned in *1 Enoch* 24–25 with the tree of life.

and because the fruit produced by the special tree is not *allowed* to be eaten by any human until after the judgment, a fact that comports well with God's refusal to allow Adam and Eve to eat of the tree of life after the fall in Gen 3:22–23.²³⁰

That the northwestern tree is a reference to the tree of life, however, is not without significant problems.²³¹ Unlike the eastern Eden, which is labeled the “garden of righteousness,” the northwestern site is nowhere called a “garden,” and the presence of trees is not necessarily indicative of a garden since the *Book of Watchers* is filled with references to trees and tree imagery not tied to gardens.²³² Also, scholars often point to 1 *En.* 25.5, a passage that has been mistranslated as saying that the fruit of the tree is “for life”—thus the moniker “tree of life.” This mistranslation likely occurred when it went from the Aramaic into the Greek. The Aramaic simply states that the fruit is food for the chosen, not “for life.”²³³ Further, as Bachmann notes, if this tree is supposed to be a reference to the tree of life as found in the Genesis narrative, it is odd that 1 *Enoch* does not explain how the tree was moved from the eastern Eden to its northwestern location, and it is also odd that, as the story of the *Watchers* unfolds, the original Eden in the east is mentioned after the heavenly Eden, a fact that would only serve to confuse readers (as it does to this day!).²³⁴

Ultimately, the tree will be transplanted in Jerusalem in the eschaton at which time its citizens will live lives as long as those of their earliest ancestors (1 *En.* 25.5). In conclusion, Tigchelaar is right that “one must conclude that the *Book of Watchers* knows only one ‘paradise,’ corresponding more

²³⁰ Bachmann calls this latter point into question by arguing for a different translation of 1 *Enoch* 25.4. Following Uhlig, rather than humans not being *allowed* or *permitted* to touch the fruit, Bachmann argues that a better understanding of the passage is that humans do not have the *power* or *ability* (*Macht*) to touch it because of their fallen nature (Bachmann, “Rooted in Paradise?,” 91; Siegbert Uhlig, *Apokalypsen: Das äthiopische Henochbuch* [JSRZ 5/6; Gütersloher: Gerd Mohn, 1984], 61).

²³¹ The critiques here are based on the critiques levied by Bachmann (“Rooted in Paradise?,” 83–107), Tigchelaar (“Eden and Paradise,” 37–62), and Bautch (*Geography of 1 Enoch*, 160–76).

²³² See 1 *En.* 3; 5; 10.18–19; 26–27. Bachmann, “Rooted in Paradise?,” 87.

²³³ Bachmann, “Rooted in Paradise?,” 90, n. 17; This is a point even Nickelsburg recognizes yet does not factor into his assessment of the nature of the tree (1 *Enoch* 1, 313).

²³⁴ Bachmann, “Rooted in Paradise?,” 90. That there is no clarity on how the tree was moved from the garden of righteousness is particularly odd because the text is willing to clarify that the tree will be transplanted from its current resting place in the northwest to Jerusalem in the eschaton (1 *En.* 25.5). The result, of course, is that 1 *Enoch's* eschaton will clearly be in Jerusalem, not the garden of Eden.

or less to the garden of Eden, be it without the Tree of Life.”²³⁵ In the *Book of Watchers*, therefore, Eden makes a retrospective appearance in ch. 32, a heavenly Eden is possible but not likely in chs. 24–25, and there is no future Eden since the eschaton will be spent in Jerusalem.²³⁶

It seems, then, that both the *Book of Watchers* and *Jubilees*, two documents that were written no later than the middle of the second-century BCE, contain narratives about Eden that fail to mention the tree of life altogether. Emphasis is instead laid on the tree of knowledge. This fact, among other data, has led many to argue that the Eden narrative of Genesis 2–3 is a composite text in which the tree of knowledge had a separate literary existence before the tree of life was redacted into that text,²³⁷ a point that is certainly possible and worth further inquiry.²³⁸

Opposite that of *Jubilees* and *1 Enoch*, *2 En.* 8.3 mentions the tree of life but does not mention the tree of knowledge. This tree is located in a heavenly Eden that awaits the righteous as their final eschatological destination. Similarly, in the *Testament of Levi* the tree of life alone is mentioned, and it reappears when the garden is once again opened at the end of the age (*T. Levi* 18.10). In the *Greek Life of Adam and Eve*, as Adam is being expelled from the garden, he requests that before he leaves he be able to eat from the tree of life. God responds as follows:

You shall not now take from it; for it was appointed to the cherubim and the flaming sword which turns to guard it because of you, that you might not taste of it and be immortal forever, but that you might have the strife which the enemy has placed in you. But when you come out of Paradise, if you guard yourself from all evil, preferring death to it, at the time of the resurrection I will raise you again, and then there shall be given to you from the tree of life, and you shall be immortal forever. (*G.L.A.E.* 28.3–4)

As has been seen, the tree of life is expected in the life to come and is expected to be the source of one's immortality. This is certainly what is

²³⁵ Tigchelaar, “Eden and Paradise,” 47.

²³⁶ Other references to Eden in *1 Enoch* can be found in the *Similitudes*: 60:23; 61:12; 70:3–4; 77:3.

²³⁷ That Genesis 2–3 is a composite text is an idea that has been around since the late 19th century (Karl Ferdinand R. Budde, *Die biblische Urgeschichte*, Gen. 1–12, 5, untersucht [Giessen: J. Ricker'sche Buchhandlung, 1883], 48–53) and has received considerable support through the years (Westermann, *Genesis 1–11*; Wallace, *The Eden Narrative*; Wyatt, “Interpreting the Creation and Fall Story,” 15–17). Stordalen even calls this the “traditional” view of Genesis 2–3 (*Echoes of Eden*, 190–92). See also Tigchelaar, “Eden and Paradise,” 45.

²³⁸ Both Philo and Josephus are aware of both trees present in Eden within the context of the Genesis narrative, thus fusing the traditions at a date no later than the first century CE. See Philo, *QG* 1.10–11; Josephus, *Ant.* 1.3–4.

happening in 4 *Ezra* 8.52 where paradise is opened to the righteous and “the tree of life is planted.”

Otzen’s conclusions, then, are appropriate.²³⁹ The tree of knowledge and the tree of life serve different purposes in the ancient texts with the former typically looking retrospectively while the latter is forward-looking. It is quite possible that these trees had a tradition history of their own until, at the latest, the first century. If one does not read 1 *Enoch* 25 as a reference to the tree of life, a position argued for above, the earliest extant documents that contain references to both the tree of life and the tree of knowledge are Philo (*QG* 1.10–11) and Josephus (*Ant.* 1.3–4).

3.3.7. *Pleasant Fragrances*

Pleasant fragrances find a role in Jewish utopianism albeit a relatively small role when compared to other *topoi*. Josephus, in reference to his description of the temple, states that the sweet smell of the air around the temple due to the burning of incense was an “indication of God’s presence” (*Ant.* 8.102). Hosea 14:4–7 provides an example of an eschatological utopian vision in which the prophet describes a healing of the nation of Israel. Twice is the fragrance of the land mentioned:

I will heal their disloyalty; I will love them freely, for my anger has turned from them. I will be like the dew to Israel; he shall blossom like the lily, he shall strike root like the forests of Lebanon. His shoots shall spread out; his beauty shall be like the olive tree, and his *fragrance like that of Lebanon*. They shall again live beneath my shadow, they shall flourish as a garden; they shall blossom like the vine, their *fragrance shall be like the wine of Lebanon*.

Israel is here cast in utopian language through the *topos* of fragrance.

Another biblical text that uses pleasant aromas to describe a utopian place is Song 4:10–16. Some scholars find Edenic overtones in this passage, which is possible given the presence of Eden in other passages from the Song of Songs:²⁴⁰

²³⁹ Otzen, “The Paradise Trees in Jewish Apocalyptic,” 151–52.

²⁴⁰ Rivka Nir has argued that “The early Jewish tradition did not . . . describe the Garden [of Eden] as a place celebrated for its spices and fragrant aromas, nor did it link the spices mentioned in Song of Songs 4:14 with the burning of incense or with the Garden of Eden” (“The Aromatic Fragrances of Paradise in the *Greek Life of Adam and Eve* and the Christian Origin of the Composition,” *NovT* 46 [2004]: 26). The first part of this statement—that Jewish tradition did not describe Eden as a place with fragrant aromas—is clearly false as will be seen in what follows (e.g. 1 *En.* 24–25; 32; 2 *En.* 8; *L.A.B.* 32.8). The second part

How sweet is your love, my sister, my bride! How much better is your love than wine, and the *fragrance* of your oils than any spice! Your lips distill nectar, my bride; honey and milk are under your tongue; the *scent* of your garments is like the scent of Lebanon. A garden locked is my sister, my bride, a garden locked, a fountain sealed. Your channel is an orchard of pomegranates with all choicest fruits, henna with nard, nard and saffron, calamus and cinnamon, with all trees of frankincense, myrrh and aloes, with all chief spices—a garden fountain, a well of living water, and flowing streams from Lebanon. Awake, O north wind, and come, O south wind! Blow upon my garden that its *fragrance* may be wafted abroad. Let my beloved come to his garden, and eat its choicest fruits.

That Eden is in view here is not necessarily obvious and is open to interpretation. The mention of a garden, twice of Lebanon (a place that is compared with Eden in Ezekiel 31), and the multiple utopian *topoi* (including milk and honey, a fountain, and living water), lends itself to an Edenic interpretation. Of all the *topoi* raised in the passage, the *topos* of fragrance is by far the most pervasive, finding its way into nearly every line.

1 *Enoch* contains two descriptions of gardens in which odor is of particular importance; one garden is Eden and contains the tree of knowledge (1 *Enoch* 32), the other garden contains a similarly described tree but is not Eden, as noted above (1 *En.* 24–25; see *topos* “Food”). The primary descriptor of the trees is not their height, strength, or anything else one might associate with trees. It is their aroma. In chapters 24–25, the author says that there is a place in which the mountains resemble a throne surrounded by fragrant trees. But one tree in particular has his attention: “Among them was a tree such as I had never smelled, and among them was no other like it. It had a fragrance sweeter smelling than all spices, and its leaves and its blossom and the tree never wither” (24.4).²⁴¹ In chapter 32, the author, this time clearly describing Eden, describes a series of sweet-smelling trees but states that the fragrance of the tree of knowledge can be smelled from a great distance (32.5). For the author of 1 *Enoch*, the *topos*

of this statement may or may not be true, though she notes a few examples of later rabbinic works that make the connection. Her argument, on this point, rests on the fact that early Jewish tradition rarely mentions Song 4:13–14 and thus is a precarious argument from silence.

²⁴¹ Many scholars associate this tree with the tree of life. Though possible, it is best to consider this tree as part of a separate tradition than the tree of life from Genesis 2–3 for the reasons mentioned above (see *topos* “Food” section “The food of Eden and the two trees”).

of odor was important for describing Eden as a place filled with sweet-smelling trees generally as well as the tree of knowledge in particular.²⁴²

In *2 Enoch*, Eden exists in the third heaven and is described as a luscious paradise where “every food [is] in yield and giving off profusely a pleasant fragrance” (8.2). As with *1 Enoch*, the description of Eden in *2 Enoch* also emphasizes the pleasant fragrance of the tree of life (8.3). Pseudo-Philo mentions only one characteristic of paradise—its fragrance, specifically the “scent of its fruit” (*L.A.B.* 32.8). Finally, in the account of Adam and Eve’s expulsion from the garden of Eden found in the *Greek Life of Adam and Eve* (*G.L.A.E.*), Adam begins pleading with God for mercy in three ways. He first asks to remain in the garden a little longer, a request God denies (*G.L.A.E.* 27.1–5). He requests to eat from the tree of life. Another denial (28.1–4). But finally, Adam requests that he be allowed to take some of the fragrances from the garden stating the purpose to be as an offering to God. To this request, God relents and allows Adam to take crocus, nard, reed, and cinnamon (29.1–6).²⁴³ The link between Eden or paradise and fragrances seems to be a strong one in ancient Judaism such that, according to *G.L.A.E.*, of all the things Adam requests to take from the garden, it is the pleasure of fragrance that God allows. It seems, therefore, that connected to traditions about Eden is the belief that there is something special about the smell of its fruit, whether that be the fruit from one of its two special trees or simply the fruit of any of the trees in the garden.²⁴⁴

In an eschatological description of Israel, the *Psalms of Solomon* describe a return of the diaspora to the city signaled by trumpets and an ease of passage, i.e. the mountains are flattened and the hills run away (cf. Isa 40:3–5). As a way of easing the passage, forests shade those coming from distant lands and “God made every fragrant tree to grow for them” (11.5). An almost identical description of flattened mountains and the shade of fragrant trees appears in Bar 5:7–8, “For God has ordered that every high mountain and the everlasting hills be made low and the valleys filled up, to make level ground, so that Israel may walk safely in the glory of God. The woods and every fragrant tree have shaded Israel at

²⁴² For other references to sweet-smelling places in *1 Enoch*, see chapters 29–31.

²⁴³ Rivka Nir (“The Aromatic Fragrances of Paradise”) has argued that the presence of these four aromatic fragrances in paradise, spices that do not align with the biblical incense offering, indicates that *G.L.A.E.* is Christian in origin. These four spices do show up in Song 4:13–14, a text which Nir claims was interpreted by Christians as a reference to the garden of Eden. See Peter-Ben Smit for a counter argument (“Incense Revisited,” 369–75).

²⁴⁴ For other examples of sweet-smelling fragrance in paradise, see *4 Ezra* 2.12; 6.44; *Apoc. Pet.* 16; *3 En.* 23.18.

God's command." Both Baruch and *Psalms of Solomon* are almost certainly referencing passages from Isaiah, which also speak of flattened mountains as a means of easing the return trip for those in the diaspora. What is not found in Isaiah, however, is any instance of fragrant trees as part of this expectation (Isa 40:4; 41:15; 42:15; 45:2; 49:11). The source of Baruch's and the *Psalms of Solomon*'s language about fragrant trees is unclear. But given the connection between Eden and fragrant odors in early Judaism, it is quite possible that these texts are speaking about a second Exodus in Edenic terms.

Finally, the presence of pleasing aromas in the Jewish eschaton is typically found in passages that link the eschaton to Eden (see the examples from 2 *Enoch* 8 and *L.A.B.* 32.8 above). Thus, in what is a realized-eschatological utopian description, the *Odes of Solomon* use odor in reference to Edenic afterlife: "And my breath was refreshed by the pleasant fragrance of the Lord. And he took me to his Paradise, wherein is the wealth of the Lord's pleasure" (11.15–16). Furthermore, 2 *Bar.* 29.7, though not an Edenic afterlife, is eschatological nevertheless: "For winds will go out in front of me every morning to bring the fragrance of aromatic fruits and clouds at the end of the day to distill the dew of health." And finally, to this list one should add the *Sib. Or.* 3.772 since it speaks of people bringing incense (an aromatic substance) to the temple in the eschaton. Pleasant odors in Jewish eschatological expectations, therefore, are most typically found when that eschaton is related to an Edenic utopia, though appropriate exceptions have been noted.

In conclusion, the *topos* of sweet-smelling fragrance is used most abundantly in Jewish literature when associated with Eden. There are examples of eschatological utopianism and nationalistic utopianism in which fragrance is an expectation, but by far, fragrance is most often found in relation to Eden and specifically the trees and fruit of Eden.

3.3.8. *Music*

Music has a special place in the Hebrew Scripture as a means of expressing emotion, whether joy, sadness, thanksgiving, or praise. For this reason, it is not surprising that music finds a place in Jewish utopianism. For example, Isaiah describes Israel's return from exile stating that a highway shall appear in the desert to lead God's holy people back to Zion, "and the ransomed of the LORD shall return, and come to Zion with singing; everlasting joy shall be upon their heads; they shall obtain joy and gladness, and sorrow and sighing shall flee away" (Isa 35:10). Isaiah later uses

music to describe the journey home from exile, only this time it is not the exiled who are making the music but the earth itself: "For you shall go out in joy, and be led back in peace; the mountains and the hills before you shall burst into song, and all the trees of the field shall clap their hands" (Isa 55:12). Jeremiah similarly states that after the rebuilding of Jerusalem "shall come thanksgiving, and the sound of merry-makers," and Israel "shall take [their] tambourines, and go forth in the dance of the merry-makers" (Jer 30:19; 31:4; cf. 31:7).

Music is most typically found in Jewish utopia in the form of hymns and praises to God. Sometimes it is a human chorus; other times it is an angelic one. An example of humans singing praises and hymns is from the *Sibylline Oracles*. At the end of days, "The souls of faithful men will cry out as follows: 'Come, let us fall on our faces throughout the people of God, and let us delight with hymns God the begetter'" (3.724–726).²⁴⁵ A chorus of angels can be found in 2 *En* 8.8 where the author is describing the heavenly Eden: "And there are 300 angels, very bright, who look after Paradise; and with never-ceasing voice and pleasant singing they worship the Lord every day and hour."²⁴⁶ Music, then, is found primarily in eschatological utopianism, most often in the form of worship.

3.3.9. *Light*

Light plays a primarily symbolic role in Jewish depictions of utopia. Sometimes utopia is described as a place where light is perpetually present and darkness is entirely absent; often light symbolism is used as an expression of glory, whether God's, a creature's, or even Jerusalem's; and sometimes light imagery, particularly the movement from darkness to light, communicates that salvation has happened perhaps ushering one into utopia. Each of these three uses of light imagery will be discussed below.

3.3.9.1. *Perpetual Presence of Light*

Eden is not typically described as existing in the perpetual presence of light;²⁴⁷ however, at least one notable example exists: 2 *Enoch* states that

²⁴⁵ For more examples of human choruses singing praises in utopia see Isa 12:5–6; 25:1; 26:1; Zeph 3:14–20; *Sib. Or.* 5.263, 267, 428; Josephus, *Ant.* 8.102.

²⁴⁶ For more examples of angelic choruses see 2 *En.* 31.1; 42.4.

²⁴⁷ Eden is, however, located "in the east" and thus is associated with the rising of the sun. Philo, for example, seizes on this fact in his allegorical reading of the Eden narrative and argues that Eden's nearness to the sun rise is proof that it should be read allegorically as talking about wisdom because "while folly is a thing sinking, dark, night-bringing,

when Eden was created, it was a place without darkness (31.2). Far more common than a night-less Eden is a night-less eschaton, an idea found in the Hebrew Scripture in two prophetic texts: Isaiah and Zechariah.²⁴⁸ Zechariah is succinct and to the point: "And there shall be continuous day (it is known to the LORD), not day and not night, for at evening time there shall be light" (Zech 14:7). Isaiah, on the other hand, gives a more elaborate depiction: "The sun shall no longer be your light by day, nor for brightness shall the moon give light to you by night; but the LORD will be your everlasting light, and your God will be your glory. Your sun shall no more go down, or your moon withdraw itself; for the LORD will be your everlasting light, and your days of mourning shall be ended" (Isa 60:19–20; cf. 30:26). Isaiah clarifies that not only will light be ever-present, but also the light will not be the light of the sun or moon—it will be from God himself.

From this biblical tradition stems a larger body of Second Temple literature in which the afterlife is described as perpetually filled with light. For example, the author of the *Similitudes* writes: "There will be light that does not cease, and to a limit of days they will not come, for darkness will first have been destroyed, and light will endure before the Lord of Spirits, the light of truth will endure forever before the Lord of Spirits" (1 *En.* 58.6). Similarly, perpetual light is part of the blessed afterlife in the *Apocalypse of Zephaniah*: "I said to the angel of the Lord, 'Then does darkness or night not exist in this place?' He said to me, 'No, because darkness does not exist in that place where the righteous and the saints are, but rather they always exist in the light' " (2.6–7). Here the author unites two themes commonly found together: light and righteousness. Where righteousness is, so is light, an idea most notably found throughout the Dead Sea Scrolls.²⁴⁹

The *Sibylline Oracles* also employ the *topos* of perpetual light in the blessed afterlife. This *topos* is at least hinted at, if not entirely intended, when the author writes, "No longer will anyone say at all 'night has come' or 'tomorrow' or 'it happened yesterday,' or worry about many days. No spring, no summer, no winter, no autumn, . . . no sunset, no sunrise. For he

wisdom is verily a thing of sunrise, all radiancy and brightness" (*Plant.* 40 [Colson and Witaker, LCL]; cf. *Leg.* 1.45–46; *QG* 1.7).

²⁴⁸ For more examples of light in the eschaton not mentioned below, see 1 *En.* 50.1; 58.6; 2 *En.* 65.9–10; 2 *Bar.* 48.50; 4 *Ezra* 2:35; *Sib. Or.* 3.787; 4.191; *L.A.B.* 51.5; *Jub.* 1.29; *G.L.A.E.* 36.1–3; 3 *En.* 5.1–6.

²⁴⁹ Light imagery is one of the most prevalent metaphors employed by the writers of the scrolls. Here the righteous are frequently called the sons of light which is contrasted with those who live in darkness (see e.g. 1QS III, 19–IV, 1).

will make a long day" (2.325–329; cf. 2.316). Again in *Sib. Or.* 5.476–483, the author expresses an eschatological situation in which the sun no longer shines, and God's light is that which guides the righteous:

A wretched generation will groan ten thousandfold at the end when *the sun is setting* so that it *never rise again*, remaining to be plunged in the waters of the ocean, for it saw the impious wickedness of many men. There will be *moonless night* round the great heaven itself. *No small mist* will cover the folds of the world about, a second time. But then *the light of God* will lead the good men, as many as sang out the praise of God.

That the eschaton will be filled with perpetual light, then, is a common motif in depictions of eschatological utopias in both the Hebrew Scripture and early Judaism.²⁵⁰

3.3.9.2. *Light as Glory*

Often in Jewish literature, light can be a way of speaking about glory—most often God's glory.²⁵¹ In Ezekiel's vision of the new Jerusalem, God returns to the temple and the entire earth shines with his glory (Ezek 43:2).²⁵² In the *Odes of Solomon*, God is also compared to the sun; and, because of the great light, both the "face of the land" receives it as does

²⁵⁰ See also the *Psalms of Solomon* for a similar idea: "Those who fear the Lord shall rise up to eternal life, and their life shall be in the Lord's light, and it shall never end" (3.12). The light in this case is supplied by the Lord, perhaps a reference to his glory and/or righteousness. Also, in *T. Lev.* 18.4 it is not the Lord but the messiah that produces the eschatological light: "This one will shine forth like the sun in the earth; he shall take away all darkness from under heaven." Cf. *1 En.* 92.4; 102.8.

The author of the *Biblical Antiquities* also uses the metaphor of light as a way of speaking about eschatological matters. Rather than focusing on the *presence* of light, however, in *L.A.B.* 19.12 the author mentions the dissolution of all light sources (sun, moon, stars) to connote the winding down of the present heaven and earth without stating a new light source to replace the old ones. After God's visitation and the subsequent resurrection, the heavens and the earth are no longer an inhabitable place—at least for the righteous. At this time, the righteous will be transported to paradise where they will dwell. It is only later in the *Biblical Antiquities* that the author mentions a new light source in paradise: twelve stones, originally from Eden or at least associated with Eden (the land of Havilah; *L.A.B.* 25.11), that will be placed in the eschatological paradise with the just, and "the just will not lack the brilliance of the sun or the moon, for the light of those most precious stones will be their light" (26.13).

²⁵¹ For the Shekinah of God, see Exod 40:34–38; 1 Kgs 8:10–11; 2 Chr 7:1–3. For biblical references to God's glory as light, see also Num 6:25; Pss 19:1; 29:1; 97:6; 108:5; Isa 24:23; 58:8; 60:1, 19; Hab 3:3–4. In the eschaton, the glory of the Lord is expected to be revealed—e.g., Isa 40:5; 60:2.

²⁵² This is a significant augmentation to God's first indwelling of the Solomonic temple in which God's glory is described as contained by a dark cloud. In Ezekiel's eschaton the glory of God will no longer be hidden but will shine over the whole world.

the face of the author (11.13–14; cf. 15.1–2). And 3 *Enoch* states that the Shekinah of God in Eden was 365,000 times brighter than the sun, and his light radiated from one end of the world to the other (3 *En.* 5.3).

The *Apocalypse of Abraham* contains a lengthy description of God that includes attributes and functions of the deity. Light imagery is used repeatedly during one portion of this passage: “Showing forth the age of the just, you make the light shine before the morning light upon your creation from your face to spend the day on the earth, and in your heavenly dwelling place (there is) an inexhaustible light of an invincible dawning from the light of your face” (17.18–19).

Sometimes glory is found not on God but on angels and humans.²⁵³ For an example of angelic glory, the *Apocalypse of Zephaniah* has the following encounter between Zephaniah and an angel: “Then I arose and stood, and I saw a great angel standing before me with his face shining like the rays of the sun in its glory since his face is like that which is perfected in its glory” (6.11). For human glory, the *Similitudes* use light as a metaphor to describe those who attain eternal life: “The righteous will be in the light of the sun, and the chosen, in the light of everlasting life. The days of their life will have no end, and the days of the holy will be innumerable” (1 *En.* 58.3). But sometimes the glorious light is not a description of the eschaton but of this life. For example, the *Sibylline Oracles* use this motif to describe the prophets of the Hebrew Scripture: “There was once among men a shining light of the sun when the harmonious ray of the prophets was being spread abroad” (5.238–239). Even more than the perpetual light of the eschaton, the light of glory is almost always connected to righteousness. This is evident in the *Community Rule* from the Dead Sea Scrolls in which the author projects an image of the eschaton where the righteous will be cleansed from all iniquity and will be returned to “the glory of Adam” (1QS IV, 15–26; esp. 23; cf. CD III, 20).

Philo uses the imagery of light and fire as attributes of glory and an inner nobility. In a description of the reversal of fortunes that will happen in the eschaton, he writes that at that time the indigent, virtuous ones will recognize the spark of nobility within themselves, “which have to be but fanned into a flame, and from them shines out the glory which for a little while was quenched” (*Praem.* 171). With the imagery of fire Philo creatively connects two commonly associated ideas, light and glory, and describes an eschatological scenario in which the light and, concomitantly, the glory are ever increasing for the virtuous.

²⁵³ See Ex 34:29ff. where Moses’ face shines after his encounter with God on Sinai.

In *Sib. Or.* 5.420–422 it is not a person or an angel described with the language of light but the city of Jerusalem: “And the city which God desired, this he made more brilliant than stars and sun and moon, and he provided ornament and made a holy temple.” In this way, Jerusalem truly becomes a “light to the nations” as prophesied in Isa 49:6.²⁵⁴

In Jewish literature the transfer of glory is often portrayed through the putting on and taking off of garments (for a fuller description of glorious garments, see the *topos* “Citizens: Clothing”). Baruch 5:1–6 employs light imagery as well as the imagery of changing garments in order to express a fundamental transformation that is expected in the eschaton. Here the transformation happens to both the city and the people of Jerusalem:

Take off the garment of your sorrow and affliction, O Jerusalem, and put on forever the beauty of the glory from God. Put on the robe of the righteousness that comes from God; put on your head the diadem of the glory of the Everlasting; for God will show your splendor everywhere under heaven. For God will give you evermore the name, “Righteous Peace, Godly Glory.” Arise, O Jerusalem, stand upon the height; look toward the east, and see your children gathered from west and east at the word of the Holy One, rejoicing that God has remembered them. For they went out from you on foot, led away by their enemies; but God will bring them back to you, carried in glory, as on a royal throne.

The promise made here in Baruch to the people of Jerusalem is that they are to press toward an eschatological utopia in which the city and its citizens will be marked with glory and righteousness. The glory of the city on the hill will shine out to all those who have been scattered, calling them home.

3.3.9.3. *Moving from Dark to Light*

Often Jewish literature uses the symbols of light and dark and the movement from the latter to the former as a way of speaking about salvation (understood broadly). Micah 7:9, for example, uses this language to express Israel’s future movement from exile and slavery to a place of freedom and vindication. Isaiah 9:2 uses light and darkness similarly: “The people who walked in darkness have seen a great light; those who lived in a land of deep darkness—on them light has shined.”²⁵⁵

²⁵⁴ For the glory of Jerusalem, see also Isa 66:11; Jer 33:9; Bar 5:1–4; *Sib. Or.* 3.787; *T. Dan.* 5.12–13.

²⁵⁵ Cf. Isa 42:16; 58:8, 10.

In one permutation of the metaphor, Israel itself acts as a light to the nations. In this way God uses the nation of Israel to bring salvation to the entire world: “I will give you as a light to the nations, that my salvation may reach to the end of the earth” (Isa 49:6; cf. Isa 42:6; 60:1–3; Tob 13:11; *Pss. Sol.* 17:31). In this use of the light imagery, an inclusivist stream of Jewish attitudes towards Gentiles is most clear.²⁵⁶

Finally, David Aune suggests a connection between light imagery and the tree of life. He writes, “In *Par. Jer.* 9:1, for example, ‘Jeremiah’ refers in prayer to the ‘fragrant aroma of living trees, true light which enlightens me [τὸ θυμίαμα τῶν δένδρων τῶν ζώντων, τὸ φῶς τὸ ἀληθινὸν τὸ φωτίζον με].’ For this reason the motif of ‘light’ or ‘flame’ is often associate with the tree of life (1QH 6:17–18; *Odes Sol.* 11:19).”²⁵⁷ In this Edenic utopia, the author uses both fragrance and light as descriptors of that place.

3.3.10. *Climate*

Though Greco-Roman descriptions of utopia use this *topos* liberally, especially with regard to the blessed afterlife and primitivistic societies, both cultural and chronological, Jewish authors rarely appeal to climate as a designator of utopia.²⁵⁸ Of all the utopian *topoi* on this list, the *topos* of climate is the least prevalent in Jewish literature though a few examples exist. Zechariah 14, a passage in which the author touches upon eight of the fourteen utopian *topoi* noted in this study,²⁵⁹ does make short reference to matters of climate with respect to the eschaton: “On that day there shall not be either cold or frost” (14:6). The difference between Zech 14:6 and descriptions of utopian climates in the Greco-Roman tradition is significant given how much attention the Greco-Roman literature pays to

²⁵⁶ See below under the *topos* “Citizens” and its subsection “Inhabitants” for more on the inclusivist and exclusivist traditions within Jewish literature.

²⁵⁷ David E. Aune, *Revelation 1–5* (WBC 52a; Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 1997), 152. Though Aune cites *Par. Jer.* 9:1 (also called *4 Baruch*), Robinson’s translation puts this at 9:3 (*OTP* 2:424).

²⁵⁸ To this *topos* one might add the metaphorical usage of life in the shadow of the Almighty. God’s shadow is used as a place of refuge throughout the biblical literature. In this way, the *topos* is more prevalent than credited here. The imagery of the shadow depicts protection from the harsh environs that surround, the heat and the sun, and it represents a pleasant location where one can rest such as the shadow of a great tree. In Isaiah’s description of the eschatological Zion, he writes that God’s glory in the form of a cloud will act as a canopy: “It will serve as a pavilion, a shade by day from the heat, and a refuge and a shelter from the storm and rain” (Isa 4:6). For shadow imagery see *Pss* 17:8; 36:7; 57:1; 63:7; 80:10; 91:1; 121:5; Isa 25:4–5; 32:2; Ezek 17:23; Hos 14:7; Sir 34:19; Bar 5:8.

²⁵⁹ See Appendix B.

describing the climate of utopia; Zechariah, however, merely mentions the cold and the frost. The difference between the Jewish and Greco-Roman traditions is exemplified in the lack of climatic descriptions not only the Hebrew Scripture but in Jewish literature on the whole.²⁶⁰

The most notable example of the *topos* of climate from Jewish literature is not surprisingly from Hellenistic Judaism.²⁶¹ Josephus is well aware of the *topos* and uses it in a way very similar to the Greco-Roman tradition to describe the afterlife abode of the Essenes. He writes,

Sharing the belief of the sons of Greece, they maintain that for virtuous souls there is reserved an abode beyond the ocean, a place which is not oppressed by rain or snow or heat, but is refreshed by the ever gentle breath of the west wind coming in from the ocean; while they relegate base souls to a murky and tempestuous dungeon, big with never-ending punishments. (*J.W.* 2.155)

That Jewish literature is largely silent with regard to this *topos* makes it all the more clear that Josephus' description says more about Josephus' thought world (largely Greco-Roman) than it does the Essenes', a point brought into relief all the more by Josephus' mention of the "west wind," an idea found throughout the Greco-Roman tradition but finds no home in the Jewish tradition.

3.3.11. *War and Peace*

A popular characteristic of utopia in Jewish literature is the lack of war and the presence of peace. The examples of a peaceable society are frequent in Jewish literature, especially with regard to nationalistic utopianism and eschatological utopianism. Furthermore, the expectation of peace often expands beyond human relationships and encompasses the entire animal kingdom and even the cosmos itself.²⁶² Philo distinguishes between two

²⁶⁰ Another possible exception, again terse, is an example of a locative-temporal utopian description from *Jubilees*, which says that the land of Shem, i.e. the land of Israel, is said to be temperate whereas Japheth's land is too cold and Ham's is too hot (8:30).

²⁶¹ This is one way in which the Greco-Roman nature of Josephus' writings comes through clearly. On that same point, Philo's Greco-Roman nature comes through when he, in passing, notes the "pleasant climate" of Eden as a reason for Adam and Eve's lack of clothing before the fall (*QG* 1.30). So too, Philo's description of the Essenes includes the mention of shared clothing, including heavy coats with which they are able to fend off the winter season (*Hypoth.* 11.12). It is possible that Philo is here trying to convey a point about the utopian nature of the group suggesting that even if the climate is itself not utopian, the community has managed to create an environment within which this utopian ideal can be achieved for all persons, i.e. through the sharing of goods.

²⁶² For two classic studies on peace in the Hebrew Scripture, see Heinrich Gross, *Die Idee des Ewigen und Allgemeinen Weltfriedens im Alten Orient und im Alten Testament*

types of enmity: that between humans and that of wild animals toward humans (*Praem.* 85–90). He proposes that if human enmity were to cease, the other would also.²⁶³ Such an idea is not uncommon in Jewish literature and, therefore, both will be addressed below.

In locative-temporal utopias, the *topos* of a peaceful world shows up in the blessings promised to the Israelites for obedience to the law.²⁶⁴ Leviticus 26:6 states, “I will grant peace in the land, and you shall lie down, and no one shall make you afraid; I will remove dangerous animals from the land, and no sword shall go through your land.”²⁶⁵ Peace is also part of the utopian description of Solomon’s dedication of the temple (1 Kgs 5:1–8:66). It should first be pointed out that the temple, the earthly dwelling place for God, was built not by David but by Solomon for the explicit reason that David was a man of war (cf. 1 Kgs 5:3–4). Peace is a necessary part of utopia and a piece that must be in place before utopia can be established.

Examples of peace in locative-temporal utopias can also be found in Second Temple Jewish literature. For example, though war is not altogether banished in the description of Jerusalem and the temple in the

(Trier: Paulinus Verlag, 1956); Hans Heinrich Schmid, *Salom “Frieden” im Alten Orient und im Alten Testament* (SBS 51; Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1971).

²⁶³ “Therefore we need not give up hope that when the wildbeasts within us are fully tamed the animals too will become tame and gentle” (Philo, *Praem.* 88 [Colson, LCL]).

²⁶⁴ Nothing is included about peace in Eden because there is little to be found—though it may have been assumed. In fact, in both the Genesis account and the retelling in *Jubilees*, one of God’s commands to Adam is to *guard* the garden, presumably from dangerous creatures. *Jubilees*, in fact, emphasizes Adam’s responsibility to guard Eden adding the source of the trouble: “the birds and beasts and cattle” (3.16). Interestingly, *Jubilees* later states that these birds, beasts, and cattle were capable of speech in the garden but not outside of it (3.28), setting up a strange scenario in which Adam is required to guard the garden from animals capable of rational thought, a scenario that does not seem quite as peaceful as one might expect. Philo, who also mentions the possibility that other animals in the garden were capable of speech (*QG* 1.32), clarifies the matter by stating that Adam needed to guard the garden from wild animals, drought, and flood (*QG* 1.14). Elsewhere Philo mentions that some of the animals within the garden were likely “military forces and allies, and a close friend” (*QG* 1.18 [Marcus, LCL]). For talking animals in the garden, see too Josephus, *Ant.* 1.41.

For peace and Eden one might point to Ezekiel 28, which compares the city of Tyre to Eden, stating that at one point it was a righteous and beautiful city but as a result of increased trade and wealth, iniquity also increased and, more importantly for this *topos*, violence did too. The assumption then is that Tyre, in its Edenic state prior to its “fall,” was a city of peace (Ezek 28:16; see also Philo, *Leg.* 1.45). Sirach too has much to say about the negative impact of commerce (see Sir 26:29; 29:1–28; 31:1–19; 40:18). For ancient attitudes of merchants, see Mathews, “Riches, Poverty, and the Faithful,” 238–40.

²⁶⁵ As with many examples below, this peace is Israel’s peace, not peace for the pagan. The passage continues by saying that Israel’s enemies will not pursue them in the land of Israel, but Israel will pursue them and kill them.

Letter of Aristeas, the author describes the place as well fortified and prepared to handle any kind of attack (*Let. Aris.* 100–102). Even the surrounding countryside is said to contain “natural defenses” suitable for making any invasion difficult (118). In another example from the *Sibylline Oracles*, Israel is protected from its enemies and within its own walls enjoys peace: “No longer will trumpet whistle the sound of war, and no longer will they perish at raging hostile hands, but they will set up trophies won from the wicked, forever” (*Sib. Or.* 5.253–255). Here, peace exists for the people within the walls of Israel, a great wall that is said to reach Joppa. But this is not peace for all. The “trophies” are certainly trophies won in battle. The tension between what constitutes peace is here displayed; it all depends on what end of the sword one stands.

Philo, describing the utopian community of the Essenes, utilizes the *topos* of war and peace. He writes: “As for darts, javelins, daggers, or the helmet, breastplate or shield, you could not find a single manufacturer of them, nor, in general, any person making weapons or engines or plying any industry concerned with war” (*Prob.* 78 [Colson, LCL]). According to Philo, not only do the Essenes not engage in war, but, even if they were engaged, they would be unable to defend themselves for lack of instruments of war.²⁶⁶

Even more common than peace in nationalistic utopias is peace in eschatological utopias within Jewish literature.²⁶⁷ The expectation of future peace is found throughout the prophets of the Hebrew Scripture. Isaiah 2:4, a classic passage that uses agrarian symbolism to depict a warless society, states: “They shall beat their swords into plowshares, and their spears into pruning hooks; nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more” (cf. Mic 4:3). Similarly, in Hosea the Lord states that if Israel repents and returns to the Lord, “I will abolish the bow, the sword, and war from the land; and I will make you lie down in safety” (Hos 2:18). On the other hand, the peace described

²⁶⁶ It is worth noting that Philo goes on to mention “peaceful” activities that can lead to war and strife including commercial dealings and navigation. As we saw in the previous chapter, these two issues are specifically mentioned in Greco-Roman traditions as the original causes of war. Nevertheless, Philo’s description of the Essenes as pacifists is problematic for reconstructing the historical Essenes in light of Josephus’ description that the group travels with weapons (*J.W.* 2.125); also problematic is the presence of the War Scroll in the Qumran library.

²⁶⁷ For peace in the eschaton see Isa 9:7; 26:3; 32:16–17; 60:17–18; Jer 33:6; Ezek 34:25; Zech 8:12, 16, 19; Bar 5:4; *Jub.* 1.29; 23.29–30; 1 *En.* 10.17; 11.2; 71.6; *L.A.B.* 19.13; *Pss. Sol.* 17.33; *T. Lev.* 18.4; *T. Dan* 5.9, 11; Philo, *Praem.* 167. Also, peace is often paired together with the idea of healing, such as Jer 30:17; *Jub.* 1.29.

by Joel is somewhat different and ironically violent in that Israel's peace comes about after the destruction of the nations. The Lord says: "I will remove the northern army far from you, and drive it into a parched and desolate land, its front into the eastern sea, and its rear into the western sea; its stench and foul smell will rise up. Surely he has done great things!" (Joel 2:20; cf. 3:19). It is only once the destruction of Israel's enemies is complete that peace abounds.²⁶⁸

As with some of the Greco-Roman literature, some Jews in the Second Temple period point to the origins of metalworking as the genesis for war and strife in the world. According the *Book of Watchers*, it is the fallen angels who first taught humans "to make swords of iron and weapons and shields and breastplates and every instrument of war" (1 *En.* 8.1).²⁶⁹ In the *Similitudes of Enoch*, Enoch sees a series of mountain ranges, each made of different metals, which crumble at the feet of the Elect One. The angel who is with Enoch explains the meaning of this vision. The angel says, "And there will not be iron for war, nor a garment for a breastplate; bronze will be of no use, and tin will not be reckoned, and lead will not be desired. All these will be wiped out and perish from the face of the earth, when the Chosen One appears before the Lord of Spirits" (52.8–9). The presence of iron and bronze are problematic because these metals promote war. They are symbolic of a world gone wrong and ultimately must be removed for peace to flourish.

Peace is an overriding theme in the apocalypse of 2 *Baruch*. The related problems of death, sickness, and aging appear throughout the book of 2 *Baruch*, and the author connects them quite skillfully in order to construct a world in which a robust peace reigns. He states the problem as such: "You [Lord] said that you would make a man for this world as a guardian over your works that it should be known that he was not created for the world, but the world for him. And now, I see that the world which was made for us, behold, it remains; but we, for whom it was made,

²⁶⁸ This idea is common in the prophets of the Hebrew Scripture, for example Jer 30:1–31:40, where peace in the eschatological utopia is completed at the expense of the destruction of Israel's enemies. See also Zech 14:1–21; Mic 5:4–5. Peace after violence is found also in the narrative of Israel's entrance into the promised land in which the Israelites are required to wipe out the inhabitants in order to have a peace of their own (e.g. Exod 23:20–33). Also, David, a warring king, is not allowed to build the temple because of the violent nature of his reign, but Solomon enjoys the (relative) peace initiated by the violence of David and is therefore allowed to build the temple (1 Kgs 5:3–4).

²⁶⁹ See also 1 *En.* 69.6; 2 *Bar.* 73.1.

depart" (14.18–19).²⁷⁰ The problem of death, whether through war or even old age, takes center stage in *2 Baruch*. The answer to this problem appears only with the introduction of the expectation of a blessed afterlife: "For that time is the end of that which is corruptible and the beginning of that which is incorruptible. . . . Therefore, it is far away from the evil things and near to those which do not die" (74.2–3).²⁷¹ In the end, death is defeated for God's righteous people who are ushered into an age of "eternal peace" (73.1). The following description encapsulates the peaceable world for which *2 Baruch* longs:

And it will happen that after he has brought down everything which is in the world, and has sat down in eternal peace on the throne of the kingdom, then joy will be revealed and rest will appear. And then health will descend in dew, and illness will vanish, and fear and tribulation and lamentation will pass away from among men, and joy will encompass the earth. And nobody will again die untimely, nor will any adversity take place suddenly. Judgment, condemnations, contentions, revenges, blood, passions, zeal, hate, and all such things will go into condemnation since they will be uprooted. For these are the things that have filled this earth with evils, and because of them life of men came in yet greater confusion. And the wild beasts will come from the wood and serve men, and the asps and dragons will come out of their holes to subject themselves to a child. (73.1–6)²⁷²

Here the entire cosmos is set right. It is a universe in which sickness, aging, and death are not present, and even the animal kingdom is ordered such that wild beasts are tamed and dangerous animals pose no threat even to the weakest of the human race.

When Second Temple Jewish literature employs the imagery of Jerusalem, or the new Jerusalem, as way of speaking about the eschaton, peace is an important eschatological expectation for this traditionally war-torn city. According to the *Testament of Dan*, in the eschaton, "Jerusalem shall no longer undergo desolation, nor shall Israel be led into captivity, because the Lord will be in her midst" (5.13).²⁷³ That the cause of peace for Jerusalem is the presence of God is worthy of note. In the

²⁷⁰ See also *2 Bar.* 15.7; 21.12–18, 22–25. In 51.16 aging is clearly an issue, and the unrighteous are said to reject a world in which aging is no longer a concern.

²⁷¹ See also *2 Bar.* 85.5.

²⁷² See also a quotation from Papias in Irenaeus, *Haer.* 5.33.4; *Sib. Or.* 5.431.

²⁷³ See also *T. Naph.* 8.3, "Through [Judah's] kingly power God will appear [dwelling among men on the earth]." Kee does not state that the phrase "dwelling among men on the earth" is a Christian interpolation, though he seems to indicate this by putting it in brackets.

world order constructed by this author, there will be no person, army, or nation capable of challenging the kingship of God. Book 3 of the *Sibylline Oracles* paints the blessed afterlife in Jerusalem, and the peace of this city is significant here.²⁷⁴ During the judgment of the earth, as war is waging everywhere and as kings turn to attack the temple, God protects those living around the temple and the temple itself from all war “as if [with] a wall of blazing fire” (3.706). After this time of judgment when the earth is put right again, the author emphasizes the peace that will fill the earth: “There will be no sword on earth or din of battle, and the earth will no longer be shaken, groaning deeply. There will no longer be war. . . . King will be friend to king to the end of the age” (3.751–56). But the peace that will define that age is not only peace among humans but of the animal kingdom as well:

Wolves and lambs will eat grass together in the mountains. Leopards will feed together with kids. Roving bears will spend the night with calves. The flesh-eating lion will eat husks at the manger like an ox, and mere infant children will lead them with ropes. For he will make the beasts on earth harmless. Serpents and asps will sleep with babies and will not harm them, for the hand of God will be upon them. (3.788–795)

Death of all stripes will be removed in the final age according to the *Sibylline Oracles*.

That peace will include peace in the animal kingdom (*Tierfrieden*) is quite common in Second Temple literature, as seen above, and is equally as common in the Hebrew Scripture, particularly the prophets.²⁷⁵ The passage above from book 3 of the *Sibylline Oracles* is almost certainly echoing Isa 11:6–9:

The wolf shall live with the lamb, the leopard shall lie down with the kid, the calf and the lion and the fatling together, and a little child shall lead them. The cow and the bear shall graze, their young shall lie down together; and the lion shall eat straw like the ox. The nursing child shall play over the hole of the asp, and the weaned child shall put its hand on the adder's den. They

²⁷⁴ Note that because book 3 of the *Sibylline Oracles* was written before the fall of the temple in 70 CE, the temple described therein is the temple of Herod, not an eschatologically reconstructed temple.

²⁷⁵ For other examples of peace in the animal kingdom, see Isa 35:9; 65:25; Hos 2:18; Ezek 34:25, 28. See too Leviticus 26 which describes a peace that comes through obedience to the law, a peace which includes removing the dangerous animals from the land. See Cornelius, “Paradise Motifs in the ‘Eschatology’ of the Minor Prophets.”

will not hurt or destroy on all my holy mountain; for the earth will be full of the knowledge of the LORD as the waters cover the sea.²⁷⁶

The peace that is expected in the eschaton is a peace that encompasses all manner of living and often includes human, animals, and the sometimes the cosmos itself.

Philo, perhaps drawing on this biblical tradition, argues that wild animals are naturally ferocious out of defense against humankind. Bears, lions, panthers, elephants, and tigers will all become tame at the sight of a humanity that is peaceable (*Praem.* 88–89). He even equates their new state with that of a Maltese dog that cheerily wags its tail at its master. Philo's list of animals adds to anything found in the Bible and includes (beyond those already mentioned) crocodiles and hippos. It should be mentioned too that Philo's *Tierfrieden* is not an eschatological utopia, it is this worldly for people who live virtuously and follow the laws of God.

3.3.12. *Citizens of Utopia*

This *topos* will address a number of issues regarding those present in utopia, beginning with an assessment of the kinds of people who were expected to dwell in utopia. Beyond that, however, will be addressed the issue of the righteousness of the individuals, the nature of the bodies of those living in utopia, the clothing of those living there, and the lack of anxiety and presence of joy expected for the citizens of utopia.

3.3.12.1. *Inhabitants*

It is worth asking, Who is present in the Jewish utopia? Often, utopia is filled with heroes of the Hebrew Scripture and Jewish tradition. Thus, 4 Macc 13:17 tells of the seven martyred brothers who upon facing death exclaim: "For if we so die, Abraham and Isaac and Jacob will welcome us, and all the fathers will praise us" (cf. 4 Macc 16:25). Regarding the Edenic utopia, on the other hand, *Jubilees* states that at present Enoch is the only person in the (earthly) garden of Eden and is there for a specific purpose: "He is there writing condemnation and judgment of the world, and all of the evils of the children of men" (*Jub.* 4.23).²⁷⁷ The *Similitudes*, however,

²⁷⁶ Isaiah 35:9 and 65:25 are similar, but based on the specific animals mentioned in *Sib. Or.* 3:788–795, it is clear this author has Isaiah 11 in mind.

²⁷⁷ In fact, *Jubilees* states that during the flood, the only earthly place where waters did not cover was Eden because of Enoch (4.24). 3 *Baruch*, however, tells the story differently. According to its account, during the Flood the water rose 15 cubits, entered paradise and

state that the eschatological Eden is populated with all the elect and the righteous ones (1 *En.* 60.8), including Enoch, of course, but also “the first fathers and the righteous, who were dwelling in that place from of old” (70.4).²⁷⁸ Similarly, 2 *Enoch* speaks of the many righteous that will be present in paradise. At the end of days when all of the righteous have been gathered into paradise, “When the last one arrives, he will bring out Adam, together with the ancestors; and he will bring them in there, so that they may be filled with joy; just as a person invites his best friends to have dinner with him and they arrive with joy” (2 *En.* 42.5). Once the number of the righteous has been complete, and the last one enters into paradise, it is the task of this last individual to bring out Adam, the original inhabitant of the garden, in order that Eden be occupied as it should have been from the beginning. Consistent, then, is the expectation that the eschatological utopia (and sometimes the Edenic) will be filled with familiar faces of Jewish lore in much the same way the Greco-Roman eschaton is filled with the heroes of Greco-Roman lore. In the Jewish eschaton, one is expected to converse with “all the righteous ones, namely, Abraham and Isaac and Jacob and Enoch and Elijah and David . . . [and speak] with them as friend to friend speaking with one another” (*Apoc. Zeph.* 9.4–5).

More than specific people, when addressing the issue of a Jewish or Israelite utopia, one must also address whether or not the nations take part in utopia. As is to be expected, diversity existed regarding whether or not Gentiles would be present. Within the Hebrew Scripture are two discernible traditions: an inclusivist tradition in which there is opportunity for the Gentiles, and an exclusivist tradition in which Israel will be saved at the expense of the Gentiles.²⁷⁹ Both inclusivism and exclusivism can be found in the prophets of the Hebrew Scripture as John Collins notes:

killed everything except for the vine of the knowledge of good and evil (according to 3 *Baruch* it was not a tree but a vine; cf. 3 *Bar.* 3.10–17). Clearly not Enoch or any other person was in Eden and threatened by the Flood.

²⁷⁸ The *Apocalypse of Abraham* also has righteous people in Eden (*Apoc. Abr.* 21.7; cf. *T. Abr.* 20.14). In the *Testament of Benjamin*, Enoch, Seth, Abraham, Isaac and Jacob are explicitly mentioned as part of the resurrection (10.6).

²⁷⁹ Admittedly, these two categories do not do justice to the complexity of the issue. Particularly with regard to inclusivism, one might wish to parse out multiple traditions that have been grouped together under this one category. Here the question of “What must one do to be saved?” comes to the fore. Jewish attitudes toward Gentiles include the following spectrum: become a “righteous Gentile,” a proselyte, a God-fearer, or do nothing at all (universalism). For a fuller discussion of these traditions, see Terence L. Donaldson, “Proselytes or ‘Righteous Gentiles’? The Status of Gentiles in Eschatological Pilgrimage Patterns of Thought,” *JSP* 7 (1990): 3–27 (esp. 8 n. 1).

"The vision of the future that we find in the last chapters of the Book of Isaiah is quite different from that of Ezekiel or Haggai. Ezekiel would build walls and gates to keep the Gentiles out. The Isaianic prophet would have the gates of Jerusalem be always open so that the wealth of the nations would flow into it (Isa 60:11)."²⁸⁰

Ezekiel's exclusivity is on display in his description of the new Jerusalem in which foreigners will be kept far from the temple, and thus the presence of God (Ezek 44:6–9).²⁸¹ Furthermore, Joel conceives of a blessed future for Israel that first requires the demise of the nations (2:20; 3:19). Here, too, the eschatological Jerusalem is described as a holy place in which God dwells, and "strangers shall never again pass through it" (3:17). Such "strangers" or "foreigners" were not allowed in certain parts of the temple for reasons of purity. Josephus even remarks that a sign was put up before the second court, written in both Greek and Latin, stating that "no foreigner was permitted to enter the holy place" (*J.W.* 5.194 [Thackeray, LCL]).²⁸²

The exclusivist tradition continues into the Second Temple period. The author of *Jubilees*, for example, retells the narrative of God's covenant to Abraham in which circumcision is commanded. About those who are not circumcised, i.e. Gentiles and disobedient Israelites, the author writes that they are "to be destroyed and annihilated from the earth and to be uprooted from the earth" (*Jub.* 15.26). In *4 Ezra* one finds that, at the eschaton, God's Anointed One will "reprove the assembled nations," "reproach them to their face," and "destroy them without effort" (*4 Ezra* 13.37–38). Other examples of this tradition can be found.²⁸³ Nevertheless, this is not the only tradition about the place of the Gentiles in the eschaton.

The inclusivist tradition—the idea that the nations will be welcomed into the utopian eschaton—is found in the Hebrew Scripture and Second

²⁸⁰ Collins, "Models of Utopia in the Biblical Tradition," 57. See also Beavis, *Jesus and Utopia*, 42–43.

²⁸¹ For exclusivism in Ezekiel, see also Kathryn Pfisterer Darr, "The Wall around Paradise: Ezekielian Ideas about the Future," *VT* 37 (1987): 271–79. She concludes with the following: "Ezekiel's depiction of marvelous future conditions is exclusive, rather than inclusive, of peoples and lands outside the land of Israel. The transformation of Israel's barren land and deadly water depicted in the book is not a foretaste of universal return to Edenic conditions. Rather, it is a manifestation of blessing poured out upon Israel and its land which does not extend beyond Israel's borders" (278–79).

²⁸² For more on the exclusivist position, see Collins, "Models of Utopia in the Biblical Tradition," 59–63; Donaldson, "Proselytes or 'Righteous Gentiles'?", 1, 8 n. 1.

²⁸³ Other examples include *2 Bar.* 40.1; *Apoc. Abr.* 31.2; 1QM.

Temple literature with relative frequency, for example in the dedication of the temple in 1 Kings.²⁸⁴ In a petition to God, Solomon exhibits an openness to foreigners, praying:

Likewise when a foreigner, who is not of your people Israel, comes from a distant land because of your name—for they shall hear of your great name, your mighty hand, and your outstretched arm—when a foreigner comes and prays toward this house, then hear in heaven your dwelling place, and do according to all that the foreigner calls to you, so that all the peoples of the earth may know your name and fear you, as do your people Israel, and so that they may know that your name has been invoked on this house that I have built. (1 Kgs 8:41–43)

This tradition can also be found in prophetic biblical passages like Isa 2:2–3: “In days to come the mountain of the LORD’s house shall be established as the highest of the mountains, and shall be raised above the hills; all the nations shall stream to it. Many peoples shall come and say, ‘Come, let us go up to the mountain of the LORD, to the house of the God of Jacob; that he may teach us his ways and that we may walk in his paths.’” Isaiah 2 is here taking part in the tradition of a universal *Völkerwallfahrt*, or what some call the “eschatological pilgrimage.”²⁸⁵ This tradition is strongly rooted in the Hebrew Scripture and makes its way into a large swath of later Jewish literature as well.²⁸⁶ The eschatological pilgrimage suggests an inclusivist attitude toward Israel’s neighbors allowing for the possibility that they will turn to God and “walk in his paths” (Isa 2:3).

In a passage that perhaps echoes God’s promise to Abraham that Israel will be a blessing to the nations, Zechariah writes that among the nations the eschatological Israel “shall be a blessing” (Zech 8:13; cp. Gen 12:3). The inclusivist nature of this passage is only confirmed a few lines later in an extended description of Gentile inclusion which takes part in the *Völkerwallfahrt* tradition:

²⁸⁴ For passages suggesting an inclusivist position, see Deut 10:19; Pss 22:27–29; 47:7–9; 102:22; 138:4–5; Isa 19:19–22; 25:6–9; 26:2; 42:6; 49:6; 52:10; 55:5; 60:3; 66:18–20; Amos 9:12; Mic 4:1–2; Zeph 3:8–10; Tob 13:8, 11; 1 En. 10:21; 50:2–5; 90:30, 37–38; Pss. Sol. 17:31–35; T. Levi 2.11; 4.4; 8.14; 14.4; 18.9; T. Jud. 22.2; 25.5; T. Naph. 8.3; T. Ash. 7.3; T. Ben. 9.2; Sib. Or. 3.702–31; 5.492–502. To this one might add the book of Jonah, which conveys a story of repentance and forgiveness of the people of Ninevah. That God would relent and have mercy on this people shows an openness toward other peoples and nations. For the possibility of Gentiles in the afterlife see, e.g., T. Naph. 8.3; T. Benj. 9.2.

²⁸⁵ Jeremias, *Jesus’ Promise to the Nations*, 55–62.

²⁸⁶ Pss 22:27–29; 47:7–9; 86:9; 102:21–22; 122:3–4; 138:4–5; Isa 2:1–4; 11:10–12; 49:22–23; 56:5–8; 60:3–17; 66:18, 23; Jer 3:17; Mic 4:1–2; Zeph 3:10; Zech 8:20–23; 14:16–17; Sib. Or. 3.710–731; T. Ben. 9.2; Pss. Sol. 17.30–35.

Thus says the LORD of hosts: Peoples shall yet come, the inhabitants of many cities; the inhabitants of one city shall go to another, saying, "Come, let us go to entreat the favor of the LORD, and to seek the LORD of hosts; I myself am going." Many peoples and strong nations shall come to seek the LORD of hosts in Jerusalem, and to entreat the favor of the LORD. Thus says the LORD of hosts: In those days ten men from nations of every language shall take hold of a Jew, grasping his garment and saying, "Let us go with you, for we have heard that God is with you." (Zech 8:20–23; cf. 14:16)

According to Zechariah, peoples and nations of every language will seek out the Lord in the eschaton. The resultant picture is that the Hebrew Scripture is rife with passages lauding an openness to the nations, at times even evangelistic openness calling Israel to be a light and a blessing.

Moving to Second Temple literature, Tobit takes part in the inclusivist tradition, even mentioning the *conversion* of the nations: "Then the nations in the whole world will all be converted and worship God in truth. They will all abandon their idols, which deceitfully have led them into their error; and in righteousness they will praise the eternal God" (Tob 14:6–7; cf. Tob 13:11). Likewise, the *Sibylline Oracles* contains a hopeful expectation for the nations. Book 3 describes a world that lapses into chaos at the end of the ages before the great judgment, and it is at this time that "all islands and cities" recognize how much God, "the Immortal," loves the sons of God resulting in the following confession from the nation, "Come, let us all fall on the ground and entreat the immortal king, the great eternal God. Let us send to the Temple, since he alone is sovereign and let us all ponder the Law of the Most High God, who is most righteous of all throughout the earth" (*Sib. Or.* 3.716–720). And only a few lines later the author directs his attention at Greece, imploring them to "serve the great God so that you may have a share in these things" (3.740). The "things" the author speaks of are described in the lines that follow and include a number of the utopian *topoi*: an abundance of food, wine, and peace (3.741–761).²⁸⁷

Josephus is explicit in his inclusivism. In Josephus' description of the Solomonic temple, Solomon is requesting that God heal any who come to the temple and repent, and Josephus adds the following caveat not present in the biblical witness:

²⁸⁷ Collins compares the utopian vision of Book 3 of the *Sibylline Oracles* with Virgil's Fourth Eclogue ("Models of Utopia," 59).

And this help I ask of Thee not alone for the Hebrews who may fall into error, but also if any come even from the ends of the earth or from wherever it may be and turn to Thee, imploring to receive some kindness, do Thou hearken and give it them. For so would all men know that . . . we are not inhumane by nature nor unfriendly to those who are not of our country, but wish that all men equally should receive aid from Thee and enjoy Thy blessings. (*Ant.* 8.116–117 [Thackeray, LCL])

The *Psalms of Solomon* shows mixed opinions concerning the fate of the Gentiles. In a passage concerning the age of the Messiah, the author states that one of the purposes of the Messiah is to “purge Jerusalem from gentiles” (*Pss. Sol.* 17.22) and later states, “the alien and the foreigner will no longer live near [Israel]” (17.28). Two lines later, however, the Gentiles are said to serve the Messiah, indicating that they are present though in the role of slave. And finally, in the most inclusivistic statement from this passage the author states, “He shall be compassionate to all the nations (who) reverently (stand) before him” (17.34). In this passage, therefore, the Gentiles have as much opportunity at living a blessed life as does Israel. The *Psalms of Solomon*, then, holds both exclusivity and inclusivity in tension within a very short space.

In conclusion, Israel and early Judaism contained within itself two strong traditions. In the first, the blessings of Israel are to the exclusion of the nations who will be punished and perhaps even annihilated in the eschaton. The second tradition allows for the possibility that Gentiles too will be part of the redemption of the world. As to whether or not Gentiles will be present in utopia, then, the answer depends on what sources you consult.

3.3.12.2. *Righteousness*

The need for righteousness as a prerequisite for entrance into the blessed afterlife (or its presence in Eden or the temple) is so ubiquitous that it is unnecessary to argue for this as part of the *topos* of citizenship.²⁸⁸ There are no ancient Jewish texts that would suggest unrighteousness is allowed,

²⁸⁸ A few references (certainly not comprehensive): Isa 33:15; Ezek 28:15; Bar 5:1–6; *Jub.* 23.22–31; 1 *En.* 10.16–22; 25.5; 38.1; 39; 58.1–3; 69.28–29; 91.18; 96; 2 *En.* 9.1; 42.4; 4 *Ezra* 7.112–115; 2 *Bar.* 15.7–8; *Sib. Or.* 2.313–314; 4.187; *Pss. Sol.* 2.34. In a lengthy messianic passage from the *Psalms of Solomon*, the author devotes a large amount of space to stating one idea: when the messiah comes he will purge the land and the people of unrighteousness (17.21–46). The statement that stands at the center of this passage also happens to stand at the center of passage’s purpose acting as a thesis statement: “And [the messiah] will be a righteous king over them, taught by God. There will be no unrighteousness among them in his days, for all shall be holy, and their king shall be the Lord Messiah” (17.32).

or perhaps even possible, in God's presence. Often, this righteousness requires a drastic reorientation of the person entering utopia. In the eschatological visions of the prophets, for example, one finds the language of a "new heart" or "new spirit." Thus Ezek 36:26–27 states, "A new heart I will give you, and a new spirit I will put within you; and I will remove from your body the heart of stone and give you a heart of flesh. I will put my spirit within you, and make you follow my statutes and be careful to follow my ordinances." Similarly the new covenant of Jeremiah will not be written on stone and require teaching, but it will be written on the hearts of God's people (Jer 31:31). Such an act indicates that a fundamental change is required in the nature of humans in utopia.

Also connected to the issue of righteousness are two seemingly unrelated issues: the health of the people and the "health" of the cosmos.²⁸⁹ Regarding the latter, there are texts that suggest that when the world is put to rights, that is to say, when the people of the world are made righteous—either through the punishment and banishment of the unrighteous or through their purgation and cleansing—God will no longer need to punish the wicked, effectively ending all plagues, illness, and the like. For example, *1 Enoch* describes such an idyllic situation: "And all the sons of men will become righteous, and all the peoples will worship (me), and all will bless me and prostrate themselves. And all the earth will be cleansed from all defilement and from all uncleanness, and I shall not again send upon them any wrath or scourge for all the generations of eternity" (10.21–22). Behind such a worldview is the idea that plagues, famines, earthquakes, and natural disasters are directly from the hand of God and are the means by which he punishes and corrects the people of the world. However, once the earth has been cleansed from all unrighteousness, there is no longer need for such tools for chastising. All natural disaster ceases, and the "health" of the cosmos is restored.²⁹⁰

3.3.12.3. *Bodies*

Often directly related to the issue of the expected righteousness in utopia is the health of the individual or people. Thus healing becomes of vital importance in utopia. Even as early as Exodus, entering the promised land is supposed to be accompanied with God taking away sickness from

²⁸⁹ For the health of the people see the discussion under "Bodies."

²⁹⁰ It is quite likely that this idea is found in Isa 32:17–18, "The effect of righteousness will be peace, and the result of righteousness, quietness and trust forever. My people will abide in a peaceful habitation, in secure dwellings, and in quiet resting places."

among the people of Israel (Exod 23:25; cf. Deut 7:15).²⁹¹ So too, regarding the eschaton, Isaiah writes, “Then the eyes of the blind shall be opened, and the ears of the deaf unstopped; then the lame shall leap like a deer, and the tongue of the speechless sing for joy” (35:5–6a; cf. Mic 4:6–7; Ezek 34:16). And finally, the fruit produced by the trees that grow along the river in the new Jerusalem are, according to Ezekiel, not only for food but are for healing (47:12).

The motif of healing²⁹² in the eschaton appears in Second Temple literature in the more traditional eschatology of *Jub.* 23.22–31, a passage that vividly compares bodily appearance in an age of unrighteousness to bodily appearance in the eschaton when righteousness reigns. Here the ancient idea of physiognomy—the ability to discern inward characteristics based on outward characteristics—is evident.²⁹³ In the time of unrighteousness, the text says that “the heads of children will be white with gray hairs, and an infant three weeks old will look aged like on whose years (are) one hundred, and their stature will be destroyed by affliction and torment” (23.25). After this the tone changes as “children...begin to search the law,” at which time the bodies of the righteous begin to age at a different pace. As righteousness increases, “the days will begin to increase and grow longer among those sons of men, generation by generation, and year by year, until their days approach a thousand years, and to a greater number of years than days. And there (will be) no old men and none who is full of days. Because all of them will be infants and children” (23.27–28). When the world is right, all are filled with life and contain the verve of youth; but when the world is not right, even infants take on the appearance of death. One’s physicality is used as an external expression of an inward state.

The outward visibility of an inward state also can be found in the following passage about one’s appearance in the afterlife in 2 *Baruch*:²⁹⁴

²⁹¹ Philo also repeats this blessing for those who keep the law and “cultivate virtue” (*Praem.* 119).

²⁹² An interesting reference to healing appears in 3 *Enoch*. The author is describing the generation of Adam and Eve who, after the Fall, live just outside the gates of the garden so as to view the Shekinah of God. The text states that the one who saw God’s glory “was not troubled by flies or gnats, by sickness or pain; malicious demons were not able to harm him, and even the angels had no power over him” (3 *En.* 5.4).

²⁹³ For more on physiognomy, see Mikeal C. Parsons, *Body and Character in Luke and Acts: The Subversion of Physiognomy in Early Christianity* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2006).

²⁹⁴ That the author of 2 *Baruch* has in mind a “bodily” afterlife is doubtful given that he later speaks of becoming like angels and stars in 51.10, likely a reference to Dan 12:3. Despite the lack of bodies, the righteous and unrighteous still have an appearance (in whatever form) that conveys an inward state of being.

And it will happen after this day which he appointed is over that both the shape of those who are found to be guilty as also the glory of those who have proved to be righteous will be changed. For the shape of those who now act wickedly will be made more evil than it is (now) so that they shall suffer torment. Also, as for the glory of those who proved to be righteous on account of my law, those who possessed intelligence in their life, and those who planted the root of wisdom in their heart—their splendor will then be glorified by transformations, and the shape of their face will be changed into the light of their beauty so that they may acquire and receive the undying world which is promised to them. . . . When [the unrighteous], therefore, will see that those over whom they are exalted now will be changed, these into the splendor of angels and those into startling visions and horrible shapes; and they will waste away even more. (51.1–3, 5)²⁹⁵

Here the physiognomy of a person is not static. Instead, as unrighteousness in a person increases, so their outward appearance becomes increasingly ugly. However, the opposite effect is also possible, i.e. a person's righteousness is also visible in their appearance. For the author of 2 *Baruch*, therefore, both righteousness and unrighteous will be visible to all in the eschaton. It will no longer be hidden but will be on display for all to see.

Second Baruch is not an anomaly, however; even Exodus notes that for those who obey the Lord's commands will be healing and not disease (Exod 15:26), and the *Testament of Simeon* describes Joseph's countenance with physiognomic traits: "Because nothing evil resided in Joseph, he was attractive in appearance and handsome to behold, for the face evidences any troubling of the spirit" (*T. Sim.* 5.1). The result, then, is that one's appearance in utopia is often understood to be a reflection of an inward reality.

3.3.12.4. *Clothing*

Clothing plays a short, yet important, role in the Eden narrative as told by Genesis. Genesis states that prior to the fall, Adam and Eve "were both naked, and were not ashamed" (2:25). In 3:7, after they eat of the tree of knowledge, shame enters the picture, particularly shame regarding nakedness, and it becomes crucial for humans to cover their nakedness in order not to be shamed. Initially they construct a fig-leaf covering and later God fashions garments out of animal skin. Though the fig leaves and animal skin, as mentioned in Genesis, receive little attention in Jewish tradition, the tradition has quite a lot to say about the "garments of Adam." Adam's garments, as mentioned by Second Temple Jewish authors, are

²⁹⁵ A similar idea can be found in *T. Zeb.* 5.1–5; *T. Benj.* 10.8; 2 *Bar.* 73.2.

typically one of two types: because of a link to the priesthood, Adam is often thought to wear a priestly garment (sometimes a jeweled garment that parallels the garb of the high priest—cf. Exod 28:15–21); and in other traditions, Adam is said to wear a “garment of glory.”²⁹⁶

Adam as priest is an idea not uncommon in Jewish literature.²⁹⁷ Starting with the Hebrew Scripture, Adam is alluded to in Ezekiel 28 where the author describes the king of Tyre as present in Eden, a second Adam so-to-speak, and states “every precious stone was [his] covering” (Ezek 28:13). In this same verse the LXX names the precious stones which are identical to those said to be on the breastplate of the high priest according to Exod 28:15–21. That an Adamic figure would wear the priestly garments suggests, at the very least, a link between Adam and the priesthood.²⁹⁸ Sirach also links Adam to the priesthood by telling of Adam’s greatness one sentence prior to an encomium on the High Priest (Sir 49:16–50:1), and the grandeur and beauty of the High Priest’s garments are mentioned only verses later (50:11).²⁹⁹ The link between Adam and the garments of the priesthood, then, is part of Adamic clothing imagery as found in Ezekiel and Second Temple Judaism.

Adam’s garments, however, are also commonly described as *glorious* without reference to priesthood.³⁰⁰ In *G.L.A.E.*, Eve states that after eating the fruit of the tree of knowledge she lost the “righteousness with which [she] had been clothed” and the “glory with which [she] was clothed”

²⁹⁶ For the garments of Adam and Eve in Jewish tradition, see Jung Hoon Kim (*The Significance of Clothing Imagery in the Pauline Corpus* [London: T&T Clark, 2004], 12–17, 30–57). Also, Stephen N. Lambden is particularly helpful (“From Fig Leaves to Fingernails: Some Notes on the Garments of Adam and Eve in the Hebrew Bible and Select Early Post-biblical Jewish Writings,” in *A Walk in the Garden: Biblical, Iconographical, and Literary Images of Eden* [ed. P. Morris and D. Sawyer; JSOTSup 136; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1992], 74–90) and more recently Alexander Toepel who focuses largely on Rabbinic literature (“When Did Adam Wear the Garments of Light?,” *JJS* 61 [2010]: 62–71).

²⁹⁷ See Lambden, “From Fig Leaves to Fingernails,” 79–80; Ruiten, “Eden and Temple,” 77–78. Beyond the sources mentioned below, see also the *Jub.* 3:26 where Adam, having been expelled from the garden, offers incense suggesting his priestly nature (see especially Ruiten, “Eden and Temple,” 77–78).

²⁹⁸ The MT contains only nine stones.

²⁹⁹ Lambden, “From Fig Leave to Fingernails,” 79–80. It is worth noting that later Rabbinic tradition also makes the connection between Adam and the High Priest (see C. T. R. Hayward, *The Jewish Temple: A Non-Biblical Sourcebook* [London: Routledge, 1996], 45).

³⁰⁰ Beyond the examples mentioned here see also Isa. 4:5; Sir. 6:29–31; 40:27; 49:16; 3 Bar. 4:16; 2 En. [J] 22:8; 3 En. 12:1; *Genesis Rabba* 11:2; see also *Targum Onqelos*, *Targum Pseudo-Jonathan*, *The Fragment Targum* and *Targum Neofiti* at Gen 3:21, all of which mention Adam’s glory, garments of glory or honor (cf. Lambden, “From Fig Leave to Fingernails,” 86; Kugel, *Traditions of the Bible*, 114–20).

(*G.L.A.E.* 20.1–2).³⁰¹ The tradition that Adam lost a “garment of glory” upon eating from the tree is not necessarily late, however. *The Community Rule*, for example, states that after the final judgment, to the elect who are purified “shall belong all the glory of Adam” (1QS IV, 23).³⁰² A few lines prior, the author describes the situation of the blessed as having “a crown of glory with majestic raiment in eternal light” (1QS IV, 7–8). Such a description fits well with the notion that Adam was clothed in glory prior to the fall, and *The Community Rule* adds that those who are the elect of God will appear similarly after God’s visitation.

As is made clear from the Qumran passage, glorious garments are not only connected to the Adam tradition, they are often part of expectations about the eschaton.³⁰³ A citizen of the eschaton is frequently given a new garment, often white, as a symbol of the newfound righteousness of that individual and the transformation required. Isaiah 61:10, for example, uses the imagery of garments as a way of noting one’s new status in the eschaton: the elect are given “garments of salvation” and “robes of righteousness.”

Angels too are often described as wearing white and glorious garments, leading some texts to conflate the notion of glorious garments and angelic garments, both of which can be given to the righteous in the afterlife.³⁰⁴ For example, the *Apocalypse of Zephaniah* describes an afterlife scene in which the narrator has just crossed a river and landed in the place of the righteous where he is given an “angelic garment.”³⁰⁵ In the same way, the author of the *Apocalypse of Abraham* states that Abraham will be given an angelic garment in the afterlife (13.14). The context of the statement is a conversation between the angel who is caring for Abraham and the fallen angel Azazel (likely a reference to the figure in Leviticus 16 to whom the scapegoat is sent on the day of atonement). Azazel is told that because of his unrighteousness, Abraham has been given the garment that was

³⁰¹ Even later, a midrash on the statement in Genesis that Adam was found naked (Gen 3:7) states that prior to their nakedness, Adam and Eve were covered with a “cloud of glory” (*Pirke de-Rabbi Eliezar* 14.20). See Nissan Rubin and Admiel Kosman, “The Clothing of the Primordial Adam as a Symbol of Apocalyptic Time in the Midrashic Sources,” *HTR* 90 (1997): 170; Lambden, “From Fig Leave to Fingernails,” 87.

³⁰² See Lambden, “From Fig Leave to Fingernails,” 80.

³⁰³ For example, 2 *Bar.* 51.5; *Ps. Sol.* 11.7; *T. Ab.* 20:10; *Ascen. Isa.* 9.6–18. Cf. Toepel, “When Did Adam Wear the Garments of Light?,” 62–63.

³⁰⁴ In Dan 10:5 and 12:7 angels are dressed in white, as is the Ancient One in Dan 7:9 whose hair is even said to be white (cf. *Ps.* 104:2). Cf. 2 *Macc* 11:8.

³⁰⁵ *Apoc. Zeph* 8.3. The narrator even states that he was able to speak the language of the angels as he prays.

formerly his, and “the corruption which was on [Abraham] has gone over to [Azazel]” (*Apoc. Ab.* 13.14).³⁰⁶

4 *Ezra* describes the future righteous ones as follows: “These are they who have put off mortal clothing and put on the immortal, and they have confessed the name of God; now they are being crowned, and receive palms” (4 *Ezra* 2.45).³⁰⁷ The reception of both crowns and garments is found also in 1QS IV, as seen above, and Bar 5:1–2. In the *Similitudes*, the righteous and elect are given “garments of glory” which become “garments of life” and never wear out (1 *En.* 62.15–16). And finally, the *Odes of Solomon* frequently use garment imagery in order to speak about transformation—often the transformation of the Odist in the here and now.³⁰⁸ In what is certainly a reference to the Eden narrative—a narrative the author appeals to elsewhere in 11.16–24; 20.7—the Odist writes: “I was covered with the covering of your spirit, and I removed from me my garments of skin” (*Odes Sol.* 25.8). That the author uses the phrase “garments of skin” is unmistakably a reference to the “garments of skin” given to Adam and Eve in the garden in Gen 3:21, a point strengthened by the fact that the author uses the plural (*garments*) to speak of a singular item, whereas he uses the singular in the only two other usages of the word *garment* in the *Odes of Solomon* (8.9; 11.11).³⁰⁹ The point the Odist is making here is that through the putting on of God’s spirit, he is able to remove the covering that was given to Adam as a temporary covering for Adam and all his descendants, and the author now finds himself in a pre-fallen state of glory. The *Urzeit* has become the *Endzeit* in the here and now.

The transformative nature of certain garments is not, however, restricted to the eschaton. The Hebrew Scripture describes the garments of the high priest as having the power to sanctify the individual who wears them (e.g.

³⁰⁶ The narrative here is clearly expanding the narrative of the Day of Atonement when the scapegoat, burdened with the sins of Israel, is sent into the wilderness “to Azazel” (Leviticus 16). The *Apocalypse of Abraham* takes Azazel to be a fallen angel who receives the sinful dead but who is not allowed to receive the bodies of the righteous (*Apoc. Ab.* 13.10).

³⁰⁷ This passage is part of the later Christian addition to the book of 4 *Ezra* which Metzger dates somewhere in the mid- to late-third century (*OTP*, 1.520).

³⁰⁸ Charlesworth notes that the Odist uses the language of taking off and putting on garments “to state emphatically that his immortality is geographically here and chronologically now” (*OTP* 2.731). See, e.g., *Odes Sol.* 11.10–11 in which the Odist states: “I abandoned the folly cast upon the earth, and stripped it off and cast it from me. And the Lord renewed me with his garment, and possessed me by his light” (cf. *Odes Sol.* 8.8; 15.8; 21:3).

³⁰⁹ See Michael Lattke, *Odes of Solomon: A Commentary*. (ed. H. W. Attridge; tr. M. Ehrhardt; Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2009), 362–64; Toepel, “When Did Adam Wear the Garments of Light?,” 66, esp. n. 20.

Exod 28:3). As Rubin and Kosman note, "Wrapping oneself in the garment transfers the priest into the transcendent plane and connects him to the holy."³¹⁰ This claim is corroborated by the author of the *Letter of Aristeas*, who, in describing the high priest's attire, notes that not only is the priest transformed, but those who view him are caught up in the transcendence of the moment:

The wearer is considered worthy of such vestments at the services. Their appearance makes one awe-struck and dumbfounded: A man would think he had come out of this world into another one. I emphatically assert that every man who comes near the spectacle of what I have described will experience astonishment and amazement beyond words, his very being transformed by the hallowed arrangement on every single detail. (*Let. Aris.* 98–99)

For the author of the letter, the high priest is transformed in such a way that it leaves those who view him awestruck.³¹¹ That the author uses the language of leaving this world and entering another is particularly striking and of a utopian nature.

3.3.12.5. *Reduced Anxiety and Increased Joy*

Jewish utopias were expected to be places without anxiety. Rather than placing this topic within the *topos* "Attitudes toward work," as with Greco-Roman utopianism, it is more appropriate to connect it to the *topos* "Citizens of utopia." The reason for this is that reduced anxiety and increased joy, while abundant in utopia, is not typically rooted in a lack of work as with the Greco-Roman tradition.³¹² It is most often tied to a complex of traditions related to the return from exile, which include a renewal of one's spirit, life in the restored Jerusalem, and an active presence with God. For example, Isa 35:10: "And the ransomed of the LORD shall return,

³¹⁰ Rubin and Kosman, "The Clothing of the Primordial Adam," 164, n. 36.

³¹¹ The changing of the high priest's clothing is found in Zech 3:4–5 where an angel comes to Joshua, the high priest, and takes away his dirty clothes, an act the text explicitly states is symbolic of the removal of Joshua's guilt, and the angel replaces the dirty clothes with festal apparel.

³¹² One exception to the rule is Josephus' telling of the Eden narrative in which God says that prior to Adam and Eve eating from the tree of knowledge, God designed their lives to be happy, "without affliction, and care, and vexation of soul," and this was accomplished, in part, because plants and food grew of their own accord without labor. Joy and decreased anxiety, for Josephus, stem not primarily from salvation or the presence of God but from little or no work (*Ant.* 1.46). The influence of Hellenism on Josephus is on display here.

Also, the *Testament of Abraham* states that in Paradise, "there is no toil, no grief, no moaning, but peace and exultation and endless life." It is quite possible that the lack of grief and moaning is due to the lack of toil, but this is not explicitly stated.

and come to Zion with singing; everlasting joy shall be upon their heads; they shall obtain joy and gladness, and sorrow and sighing shall flee away.” Or again in Isa 25:8, “Then the Lord God will wipe away the tears from the faces, and the disgrace of his people he will take away from all the earth.” In both examples, God acts to save his people Israel and redeem them from exile. It is clear that the “tears” and “disgrace” are linked not to an overburdened lifestyle that simply requires an easier life. They are linked to the fact that Israel has been an occupied territory, an enslaved and disgraced people, and with the dawn of the eschaton, the greatness of Israel will once again be reconstituted³¹³ and, more importantly, the people of Israel will once again dwell with their God.³¹⁴

3.3.13. *Work*

Genesis 2–3 states that God expected Adam and Eve to perform certain tasks in the garden of Eden.³¹⁵ Specifically, they were required to “guard” and “till” the land (2:5, 15; see above, “Food”). Nevertheless, this work required in Eden is certainly qualitatively, and perhaps quantitatively, different from that required after Eden.³¹⁶ God’s curse directed at Adam is primarily directed at agricultural work: “Cursed is the ground because of you; in toil you shall eat of it all the days of your life; thorns and thistles it shall bring forth for you; and you shall eat the plants of the field. By the sweat of your face you shall eat bread until you return to the

³¹³ Isaiah 60:15 is exemplary: “Whereas you have been forsaken and hated, with no one passing through, I will make you majestic forever, a joy from age to age.”

³¹⁴ The expectation of increased joy and decreased anxiety is particularly Isaianic: cf. Isa 35:4, 10; 51:11; 55:12; 60:20; 61:1–3; 65:18–19; Jer 31:13, 16; Ps 116:8. Philo also connects an abundance of joy to the worship and service of God in his allegorical description of Eden (*Plant.* 38; cf. *Leg.* 1.45–46; *QG* 1.7).

³¹⁵ See Amit, “Biblical Utopianism,” 16. For a non-Edenic example of work for the “blessed,” see Ps.-Phoc. 162: “There is no easy work without toil, (neither) for men, nor for the blessed themselves.” What is meant here by “the blessed” is most likely a reference to the heavenly bodies of the sun, moon, and stars since the same language is used in line 75. For Pseudo-Phocylides, the heavenly bodies have semi-divine qualities (a fact that has led some to question whether this is a Jewish document), and thus the presence and expectation of work is significant.

³¹⁶ *GLAE* 24–26 contains a stylized description of the cursing of Adam, Eve, and the snake. God says to Adam, “Because you transgressed my commandment and listened to your wife, cursed is the ground in your labors. For when you work it, it will not give its strength” (24.1–2). The statement that “it will not yield its strength” comes not from Genesis 3 but Genesis 4 (the curse of Cain). Nevertheless, the author of *GLAE* saw fit to equate it with Adam’s curse because of the implicit assumption that the ground now requires extra effort to coax it into doing what it once did naturally.

ground" (Gen 3:17–19).³¹⁷ After this moment, the work that once was a natural part of a utopian life now causes Adam much toil and hardship. Work, as defined before and after the fall, then, is significantly different, a point directly tied to Adam's removal from Eden.

The author of *Jubilees* gives a similar account of work in and after Eden, only he emphasizes the presence of work in the garden in a way that Genesis does not.³¹⁸ The language of guarding and tilling is minimally present in Genesis (three times between the two words), but in *Jubilees* working is much more prevalent (nine times total). Further, the narrator (an angel) explicitly states that "we gave him work" while in the garden (3.15), i.e., the angels directed Adam on how properly to cultivate the land. For the author of *Jubilees*, the art of agriculture, then, is an art that stems from the angels themselves.³¹⁹ This, of course, is in direct contrast to the Greco-Roman traditions that argues the art of agriculture led to the decline of humanity.³²⁰

Philo remarks on the difference in work before and after the fall of Adam and Eve by noting that before the judgment of Adam and Eve God supplied food at a moment's notice. After their sin and subsequent judgment, however, the immediacy of food was no longer an aspect of the human experience lest they "indulg[e] the twin evils of idleness and satiety" (*Opif.* 169 [Colson and Whitaker, LCL]). In *Questions and Answers on Genesis*, Philo addresses the command for Adam to guard and to till the garden, noting that such a command seems unnecessary since God's paradise would have been perfect not requiring a keeper (*QG* 1.14).³²¹ Nevertheless, Philo states that the reason for Adam's required working is to provide a template for

³¹⁷ Interestingly, the Eden narrative only uses the word *curse* (אָרֶר) twice, neither time is it directed at Adam or Eve. Instead, God first curses the serpent and, as seen in this quotation, God then curses the ground.

³¹⁸ See above, *topos* "Food."

³¹⁹ See also *Vita* 22.2 in which the angel Michael is said to teach Adam and Eve how to till the ground for the production of food. In the *Vita*, however, the couple has already been expelled from Eden.

³²⁰ As noted in the previous chapter, the Greco-Roman tradition contains a strong precedent for understanding agricultural skill as a contributing factor to the downfall of society, especially in the primitivistic mindset (see chapter 2 under the *topos* "Food"). For another positive assessment of agriculture in Judaism, see *T. Iss.* 3.1–6.4.

³²¹ Later in *Questions and Answers on Genesis* Philo paints a picture of Eden in which all things worked in harmony: "Everything helped and co-operated with the founder of mankind, such as earth, rivers, sea, air, light and sky. Also co-operated all the species of fruit and plants and herds of cattle. And wild animals were not ferocious to him" (*QG* 1.23 [Marcus, LCL]).

future generations that they may not be overcome by idleness and the land by invasion or devastation through lack of care.

Nationalistic utopian descriptions are similar to their Edenic counterpart in that work is required, but it is lightened, or at least enjoyable, toil. For example, in a description of the land around Jerusalem, the author of the *Letter of Aristeas* notes that it is abundantly fertile but also highlights that proper care of the land is required in order for the land to yield as it does. He specifically emphasizes the remarkable nature of the zeal of the farmers (*Let. Aris.* 107–113). Or in another example, Philo remarks on the Essenes work ethic, and though he does not mention a reduction in work load, he states that their attitudes are such that they enjoy their labor and believe it to be more valuable for both body and soul than the work of the athlete (*Hypoth.* 11.6–9; cf. *Prob.* 76; Josephus, *Ant.* 18.19).

The eschaton as described by the Hebrew Scripture is once again similar. Work is typically present in the eschaton, but the work is not described as burdensome or laborious. Furthermore, the vast majority of the work mentioned is agrarian in nature, a motif concomitant with an abundance of food in the eschaton.³²² Thus, unlike the fanciful descriptions of Greco-Roman utopias in which the food grows itself and prepares itself to be eaten, food in the utopias of the Hebrew Scripture still require manual labor. For example, despite the fact that Amos depicts an easier life in the eschaton, life still includes plowing fields and treading grapes (9:13). In Isa 65:21–23, the people are building houses, planting vineyards; and even though “they shall not labor in vain,” they are still laboring nonetheless. The presence of industry in the eschaton, then, is an important aspect of this Jewish utopian *topos*.³²³

Finally, Second Temple descriptions of the blessed afterlife also mention the ease of work during the eschaton.³²⁴ 2 *Baruch* connects work in the afterlife to work in the garden of Eden by describing a vision of the

³²² Cf. Isa 62:8–9; 65:22–23; Ezek 36:33–36.

³²³ It is worth noting that Isaiah also takes part in the *topos* of ease in the eschaton by putting “foreigners” to work, doing tasks that would typically be done either by slaves or by the people themselves. This is explicit in Isa 61:5, “Strangers shall stand and feed your flocks, foreigners shall till your land and dress your vines” (cf. Isa 60:7, 10). But this ease should not be confused with a Greco-Roman ideal of no work in the eschaton but should be aligned with the idea of a great reversal in the eschaton at which time those who were slaves in this age become masters in the next.

³²⁴ See also *Sib. Or.* 2.313–339 which describes the blessed afterlife as a “life without care.” The closest one gets to a work-less afterlife is in a very brief statement in *T. Abr.* 20:14: “there is no toil.”

blessed afterlife in which the curses given to Adam and Eve are reversed.³²⁵ The difficulty of bearing fruit and the difficulty of childbirth are both mitigated and presumably returned to a pre-fallen state. And just as there was work in the garden (however alleviated), so also 2 *Baruch* suggests that work will remain in the world to come: "Women will no longer have pain when they bear, nor will they be tormented when they yield the fruits of their womb. And it will happen in those days that the reapers will not become tired, and the farmers will not wear themselves out, because the products of themselves will shoot out speedily, during the time that they work on them in full tranquility" (73.7–74.1). It is clear that the author is using the Eden narrative as the story of Israel's future. The life to come represents humanity's second chance at life in the paradise of God.

What one does not find in the Jewish tradition is a utopian description of any stripe—Edenic, nationalistic, or eschatological—in which all work is abolished. Whether in Eden or in the eschaton, the Jewish tradition embraced the necessity of balancing industry and leisure as if these two aspects of the human condition necessarily encourage and sustain one another.

3.3.14. *Divine Presence*

God was present with Adam and Eve in the garden until they were banished. God was present with the Israelites in the desert within the confines of the tabernacle. And God was present in the promised land within the temple, a structure twice destroyed by foreign invaders leading some Jews to believe that God's presence left with the destruction of the temple. Israel's prophets await the return of God to Jerusalem when all is put right. The history of the people of Israel, then, is marked with a deep concern for God's presence and absence. It should be no surprise that this *topos* should be part of a Jewish utopia, whether Edenic, nationalistic, or eschatological.

In order to lead Israel into the promised land in the Exodus account, God appears to them in the form of a cloud by day and a pillar of fire in the cloud by night (Exod 13:21–22, etc.). Further, God grants an angel to help the people on this journey (Exod 14:19–24; 23:20–23; 33:2; cf. Num 20:16; Judg 2:1, etc.). The angel is said to act as both guard and guide to the

³²⁵ Besides the example listed here, see also 2 *Bar.* 51.14, "For they have been saved from this world of affliction and have put down the burden of anguishes." Also, *Odes Sol.* 11.12 reports a realized eschatology in which the author is said to be given "immortal rest." No details are given about the nature of that rest.

people, ushering them safely into the land insofar as the people listen and obey, something they are prone not to do. Nevertheless, God's presence and the presence of an angel assist the people into the locative-temporal utopia of the promised land, a land flowing with milk and honey.

God's presence is next promised to the people of Israel if they obey the laws set forth by God. In Lev 26:12 God says to the people that if they obey, "I will walk among you, and will be your God, and you shall be my people."

The presence of God in a cloud returns at the dedication of Solomon's temple. At this time, the priests enter into the most holy place in order to put the ark of the covenant there, and upon exiting the holy of holies, "a cloud filled the house of the LORD, so that the priests could not stand to minister because of the cloud; for the glory of the LORD filled the house of the LORD" (1 Kgs 8:10b–11). Solomon recognizes that the Lord is now present in the temple and proclaims that he has built a house for the Lord that the Lord may dwell there forever (1 Kgs 8:13; cf. 6:13). God's presence becomes a vitally important part of the story of the Hebrew Scripture with God repeatedly threatening to withdraw his presence from his people.³²⁶

In the Eden narrative as found in Genesis 2–3, there are a number of signals that God dwells in the midst of Adam and Eve and has a relationship with them that is of a very personal nature. First, in 2:16–17 God speaks directly to the couple in an unmediated fashion suggesting an intimate relationship. Second, in 2:19, it is God who creates and then brings each and every animal before Adam to be named. These animals are meant to act as a partner for Adam who is said to be alone. The scene recounts an exchange between two friends, God and Adam, the former of which is helping the other find companionship. That God assesses the situation and recognizes Adam's aloneness suggests that the relationship between Adam and God was one that still required companionship of a different sort than God's and Adam's, but Adam nevertheless had a relationship of sorts with God. Third, after Adam and Eve eat of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, Gen 3:8–9 says, "They heard the sound of the LORD God walking in the garden at the time of the evening breeze, and the man and his wife hid themselves from the presence of the LORD God among the trees of the garden. But the LORD God called to the man, and said to him, 'Where are you?'" In this passage God takes on anthropomorphic characteristics by walking in the garden. Adam and Eve are even able

³²⁶ Josephus also records the dedication of the temple and remarks concerning God's presence (*Ant.* 8.1–129; esp. 102, 106–110, 114).

to hide from him. Clearly from the Genesis account, God dwells in the garden in a very real, perhaps tangible, way.

The presence of God in Eden is also noted in 2 *En.* 8.3: "And in the midst [of a group of trees was] the tree of life, at that place where the Lord takes a rest when he goes into paradise." In 2 *Enoch*, paradise or Eden is located not on earth but in the third heaven perhaps making it that much more appropriate as a resting place for God given that God dwells in the heavens. But not only does God go to rest in paradise, so also do 300 angels who take care of it (8.8).³²⁷

God's direct, unmediated presence, however, is not found in every Edenic description. For example, Ezekiel compares the city of Tyre to Eden. In this comparison the king of Tyre is placed in Eden "with an anointed cherub as guardian" (Ezek 28:14). The king does not, however, have unmediated access to God himself. Similarly, *Jubilees* retells the Eden narrative from Gen 2–3 with a significant difference. The only unmediated access to God found in this passage is when God curses Adam, Eve and the serpent for disobeying his earlier command, a command only related indirectly in the *Jubilees* account (3.23–25). One does not find an account of God bringing animals before Adam to be named. Nor is there any mention of God walking in the garden in the evening breeze. If the relationship between Adam and God is distanced, in its place *Jubilees* hints that Adam and Eve had a relationship with the angels of the garden, something not found in Genesis. The narrator of *Jubilees*, who is described as the "angel of the presence" (2.1), twice suggests he has a companionship with Adam and Eve, a companionship that is not explicitly found between the couple and God. In *Jub.* 2.9 the angel states that it was the angels who initially escorted Adam into the garden. And then later in *Jub.* 2.15, the angel states that "we gave him work and we were teaching him to do everything which was appropriate for tilling." The act of teaching particularly suggests that the contact between Adam and the angels was more substantial than that of God and Adam since nowhere does *Jubilees* hint that Adam had such contact with God—a point that is clearly at odds with the Genesis account.³²⁸

³²⁷ See also 2 *En.* 31.1; 42.4; 3 *En.* 5.1–5. Philo turns the tradition of God's presence in Eden on its head by stating that God cannot be bound by his own creation, and thus one should read the Eden narrative allegorically (*Plant.* 32–35; cf. *Leg.* 1.43–44).

³²⁸ There is, however, the statement in 8.19 that the garden of Eden is the "dwelling of the Lord," but at no point does *Jubilees* connect this to dwelling with Adam (or Enoch who, according to *Jub.* 4.23–26, presently lives in Eden).

The presence of God in the eschaton is quite naturally prevalent throughout Jewish literature.³²⁹ Joel repeats this idea in his description of the eschatological Jerusalem stating that when Jerusalem is restored to a holy place, God will dwell in Zion (2:27; 3:17, 21). Through the prophet Jeremiah the Lord comforts Israel saying that despite exile (framed as God's chastisement), "I am with you." And in Ezekiel, God declares, "I myself will search for my sheep, and will seek them out," and "I, the Lord their God, am with them" (Ezek 34:11, 30). But more profoundly, in Ezekiel's description of the new Jerusalem, the author describes the return of God to the temple.

And there, the glory of the God of Israel was coming from the east; the sound was like the sound of mighty waters; and the earth shone with his glory.... As the glory of the LORD entered the temple by the gate facing east, the spirit lifted me up and brought me into the inner court; and the glory of the LORD filled the temple. While the man was standing beside me, I heard someone speaking to me out of the temple. He said to me: Mortal, this is the place of my throne and the place for the soles of my feet, where I will reside among the people of Israel forever. (Ezek 43:2, 4–7a)

This description of God's return to the temple mimics the original entrance of God into Solomon's temple with a significant difference. The glory of God described in 1 Kgs 8:10–12 is described as a cloud and with darkness (cf. 2 Chr 5:13–6:1; Exod 19:9). In contrast, Ezekiel notes that rather than a dark cloud hiding God's glory, God's glory is in full view for all to see, shining over the entire earth. God's presence is specifically noted as an aspect of the new Jerusalem. In a poignant conclusion to the book of Ezekiel, the author writes that from that time forward the city will be renamed. Its new name will be יהוה שמה, "The LORD is There" (Ezek 48:35).

3.4. CONCLUSION

As with chapter two, this chapter is an attempt to fill out the description of utopianism, this time according to Jewish tradition. The chapter progresses in two parts. The first half focuses on classifying three types of utopian expression: Edenic utopianism, nationalistic utopianism, and eschatological utopianism. At this point, the primary literature from which the traditions about utopia are drawn is introduced. Though Jewish

³²⁹ Beyond the examples given here, see also Isa 12:6; 33:21; 52:8; 64:1–2; 66:1; Mic 4:1–2, 7; Zech 8:3, 23; Philo, *Gig.* 14; *Cher.* 115; *T. Dan* 5:13; *T. Benj.* 10.11; *L.A.B.* 19.12.

utopianism does not have a political utopia as one finds in the *Republic* of Plato, nationalistic utopianism shares the interest in law making as a means of creating utopia, particularly in what is here called legal-covenantal utopianism. Thus the Sabbath laws and the year of Jubilee are legal structures aimed at building a society in which the good life is possible for all. The other form of nationalistic utopianism, locative-temporal, emphasizes the importance of place—Jerusalem and Israel—as that place where utopianism is located. Edenic utopianism and eschatological utopianism have some crossover when Eden is envisioned as both *Urzeit* and *Endzeit*. In the Hebrew Scripture, one finds almost no interest in Eden outside of Genesis (with a few exceptions in Ezekiel), but in the Second Temple period, interest in Eden as the abode of the righteous increases. In this way, Edenic utopianism has a natural corollary with eschatological utopianism, though it is distinguishable insofar as Eden retains its primeval features. Outside of the book of Daniel, eschatological utopianism in the Hebrew Scripture is focused solely on the fate of Israel as a nation (rather than the fate of individuals), and the idea of life after death is not explicitly present. It is not until Second Temple Judaism that interest in the afterlife of the individual begins to surge.

The second half of the chapter moves to explicate the fourteen designated *topoi* and note the ways in which these *topoi* are distinctly Jewish. In Jewish tradition, the two traditions of Eden and Jerusalem, one rural and the other urban, weigh heavy on conceptions of the setting of utopia. For this reason, utopian visions are cast in both rural and urban settings sometimes with both present. Jewish conceptions of wealth are variegated, though the accumulation of wealth and its abuses are typically criticized. The temple is of vital importance to all three strands of utopianism; it is a central aspect in locative-temporal utopianism, it is always present in the eschatological utopia, and even Eden is sometimes described as if it were the temple itself. Rivers are particularly important in the eschaton as that which flows from Jerusalem; food is found in abundance in all forms of utopianism, as is wine. Fragrance is mostly found as a part of the eschatological Eden and typically associated with the trees of Eden, most importantly the tree of life and the tree of knowledge. Utopian music is mostly present in the worship and praise of God, and the light of the eschatological utopia is sometimes provided by God's glory. Of all the *topoi*, that of climate is found least in the Jewish tradition, a fact that stands in stark contrast to its popularity in Greco-Roman utopianism. Like the Greco-Roman tradition, however, peace is an important aspect of all forms of Jewish utopianism. Regarding who is present in utopia, Jewish tradition

unequivocally requires absolute righteousness, but there is less agreement on whether or not Gentiles, or the nations, are part of the eschatological utopia. There are both inclusivist and exclusivist traditions contributing to the issue's ambiguity. Lightened work in utopia is an expectation in the Jewish tradition, often appealing to a reverse of God's curse in the Eden narrative that humanity will toil on the land because of Adam's sin. Finally, in all three forms of utopianism, the presence of the divine is a key part of utopian expectations. In Eden, the first couple walked with God. In nationalistic utopianism, especially locative-temporal, God is present in the Jerusalem temple. And in the eschatological utopia, God's presence is an essential element for the good life.

CHAPTER FOUR

THE UTOPIA OF REVELATION 21–22

4.1. INTRODUCTION

The previous two chapters constitute a survey of ancient utopian expectations as expressed in Greco-Roman and Jewish literature. Using the data collated in those chapters, we now turn to the book of Revelation in order to read the description of the new Jerusalem as depicted in Rev 21:1–22:5 through the lens of ancient utopianism.

What follows is an exploration in how John's text might have been heard by his original audience(s), a diverse group of Christians certainly made up of Jews and Gentiles of varying backgrounds.¹ That John is writing not to an audience but to audiences is not insignificant even if it has been largely overlooked by modern scholarship. In particular, this study is interested in how an auditor steeped in Jewish traditions, informed by both Israel's Scriptures and early Jewish traditions, would hear Revelation 21–22 differently than would an auditor who listens with an ear tuned to Greco-Roman resonances. The two previous chapters, then, serve as the echo chambers of these two hypothetical auditors. Throughout the chapter, these two auditors will be referred to as the "Jewish-minded" auditor and the "Greco-Roman-minded" (GR-minded) auditor, both of whom utilize the two literary traditions from which these readers/auditors would have drawn.² While these tidy categories are somewhat artificial, they

¹ Throughout this chapter, the author will be referred to as John as he names himself in the opening lines of the Revelation. Which John is in view here is not a question this study wishes to raise. For more on Revelation's audience(s), see below under "The Audiences of Revelation." Also, for clarification on the methodology employed here, consult the first chapter.

² On the difference between auditor and reader, see chapter one. This study uses these terms interchangeably, though preference is given to the former since the majority of John's audience would have "heard" Revelation not "read" it. Also, the designation "Jewish-minded auditor" rather than "Jewish auditor" has been chosen purposefully. This subtle distinction is a recognition that many ancient Jews would have been conversant in Greco-Roman literature—e.g. Josephus and Philo; thus Philo would be a "Jewish auditor" (though obviously not of Revelation) but not solely a "Jewish-minded auditor," as the term is employed here, because he engages both Greco-Roman and Jewish traditions. I am concerned with the Jewish-minded auditor, which is defined as one who reads or hears a text

serve as two extremes of the spectrum of auditors that heard John's Apocalypse since we do not have access to any "actual auditors."³ And though it is quite likely that many of the actual auditors would have been situated somewhere closer to the middle of the spectrum from Greco-Roman to Jewish and would have had some awareness of both traditions, the categories are useful for heuristic purposes in that they open up a broad panoply of traditions that might have resonated with John's readers by recognizing and attempting to account for the diverse nature of John's audience.⁴ Highlighting the diversity (whether ethnic, socio-economic, gender, or some other distinction) of John's audience is a particularly worthwhile endeavor given that he addresses his apocalypse to seven cities in Asia Minor, each of which differ from the other as evidenced by the various words of praise and condemnation, and each of which almost certainly contain a cross-section of society including socio-economic disparity and, more to the point for this study, Jew-Gentile disparity.⁵

This chapter, therefore, will pose possible readings for how Revelation's original audience would have heard the final chapters of this work in light of the fourteen utopian *topoi* elaborated upon in chapters two and three. The chapter will proceed by asking if and how John employs each given

through the lenses given him by his experience and knowledge of Judaism over against any knowledge of Greco-Roman literature and culture. The Greco-Roman-minded auditor is the reverse opposite. Though the majority of the individuals within John's audience sit somewhere between these two pure types, to try and account for the shades that exist between the pure types would be to enter a quagmire that would be impossible to navigate. One should assume, then, that individuals of the actual audience might have engaged with parts of each tradition, some with neither, and some with both simultaneously.

³ Or what Peter Rabinowitz calls the "actual audience," which he defines as "the flesh-and-blood people who read the book" (Peter J. Rabinowitz, "Truth in Fiction: A Reexamination of Audiences," *Critical Inquiry* 4 [1977]: 126).

⁴ Though the audience as defined by this study is a construct, it should be recognized that all audience-oriented criticisms work with constructed audiences save for those who have access to the "actual audience," a luxury ancient historians do not have. Rabinowitz's other "audiences," authorial and narrative, are both constructs, as is Iser's "implied reader" and any number of "readers" posited by literary critics (ideal, model, competent, etc.; cf. Rabinowitz, "Truth in Fiction," 126; Wolfgang Iser, *The Implied Reader: Patterns in Communication in Prose Fiction from Bunyan to Beckett* [Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1974]; see also Susan R. Suleiman for the variety of audience-oriented approaches ["Introduction: Varieties of Audience-Oriented Criticism," in *The Reader in the Text: Essays on Audience and Interpretation* (ed. S. R. Suleiman and I. Crosman; Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1980)]). That this study is working with a constructed audience, therefore, is unavoidable. The audience consists of two pure types for the purpose of greater methodological clarity with regard to the nature of the audience.

⁵ Note, for example, those in "poverty" at Smyrna (2:9) in contrast to the "rich" of Laodicea (3:17).

topos and how his two audiences would have heard his utopian vision in light of these *topoi*. While this study is not disinterested in verbal parallels, echoes, or allusions to the Hebrew Scriptures (or LXX), a subject that has received a significant amount of attention with regard to Revelation,⁶ it is most interested in locating the broader traditions that John's diverse audience might have heard.⁷ A broader approach comports with an audience-oriented methodology because it is more likely that the original audience was not an audience capable of in-depth study and comparison of John's writings with other ancient texts.⁸ Rather, the original audience was more

⁶ With the rise of intertextuality over the last two decades, scholars have given considerable attention to how John utilizes and appeals to the Hebrew Scripture. See especially, G. K. Beale, *The Use of Daniel in Jewish Apocalyptic Literature and in the Revelation of St. John* (Lanham, Md.: University Press of America, 1984); Steve Moyise, *The Old Testament in the Book of Revelation* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995); David Mathewson, *A New Heaven and a New Earth: The Meaning and Function of the Old Testament in Revelation 21.1–22.5* (JSNTSup 238; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2003); Jan Fekkes, III, *Isaiah and Prophetic Traditions in the Book of Revelation: Visionary Antecedents and their Developments* (JSNTSup 93; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1994); Marko Jauhiainen, *The Use of Zechariah in Revelation* (WUNT 2:199; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005); William J. Dumbrell, *The End of the Beginning: Revelation 21–22 and the Old Testament* (Homebush West, NSW: Lancer Books, 1985); Mathias Rissi, *The Future of the World: An Exegetical Study of Rev. 19.11–22.15* (SBT 23; London: SCM Press, 1972). Other important articles and monographs include Jon Paulien, "Dreading the Whirlwind: Intertextuality and the Use of the Old Testament in Revelation," *AUSS* 39 (2001): 5–22; G. K. Beale, "A Response to Jon Paulien on the Use of the Old Testament in Revelation," *AUSS* 39 (2001): 23–33; Steve Moyise, "Authorial Intention and the Book of Revelation," *AUSS* 39 (2001): 35–40; idem, "Does the Author of Revelation Misappropriate the Scriptures?," *AUSS* 40 (2002): 3–21; idem, "Intertextuality and the Use of Scripture in the Book of Revelation?," *Scriptura* 84 (2003): 391–401; idem, "The Language of the Old Testament in the Apocalypse," *JSNT* 76 (1999): 97–113; Jeffrey Marshall Vogelgesang, "The Interpretation of Ezekiel in the Book of Revelation" (Ph.D. diss., Harvard University, 1985); Jean-Pierre Ruiz, *Ezekiel in the Apocalypse: The Transformation of Prophetic Language in Revelation 16:17–19:10* (European University Studies 23/376; Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 1989).

⁷ By altering the point at which meaning is made—i.e. in the mind of the readers rather than the author—I have strengthened the platform for appealing to a larger set of traditions that include a full range of Greco-Roman traditions. Some scholars are not timid in appealing to Greco-Roman traditions (in particular Aune's Revelation commentary as well as Adela Yarbro Collins' classic study *The Combat Myth in the Book of Revelation* [HDR 9; Missoula: Scholars Press, 1976]). Meanwhile, other scholars are critical, or at least cautious, of appeals to Greco-Roman traditions (cf. Pierre Prigent, *Commentary on the Apocalypse of St. John* [tr. W. Pradels; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2001], 50–68; Ben Witherington, III, *Revelation* [NCBC; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003], 275). All of these studies, however, approach the text from the point of view of the author.

⁸ Christopher Stanley, writing about the biblical literacy of Paul's audiences, writes modern scholars often mistakenly characterize the early church as a place where the illiterate would be trained by the literate so that Paul's audience would be able to hear the biblical echoes Paul writes. In contrast, Stanley suggests "this proposal overlooks the many social barriers that would have hindered such a system. At the most basic level, it

likely to interact with broad traditions and ideas than with strict, verbal parallels. Nevertheless, given John's insistence on utilizing the Hebrew Scriptures and the amount of secondary literature devoted to it, questions of intertextuality are occasionally entertained.⁹

In the book of Revelation, the author is regularly an actor in his own narrative. Throughout chapters 21–22, for example, the author speaks in the first person singular and relates his experience of seeing the new Jerusalem as he is led and guided by an angel. In this way, the author as constructed by the text—i.e. the “implied author”—becomes part of the meaning-making process, even for an audience oriented approach, as the audience reads the text as a product of this author's experience. For this reason, a brief word about the implied author of Revelation is necessary.

In Revelation 1, the author calls himself John and states that he is writing prophecy, prophecy that will “soon take place,” and, thus, he considers himself to be situated at the end of the age. John writes to seven churches in Asia, all of whom are located in large urban centers. Further, in 1:9 John states that he shares in the “persecution” of his audience, though the exact nature of the persecution is not stated. In the same verse, however, he does mention that he is writing from the island of Patmos, which since the time of Eusebius was considered a Roman penal colony indicating John was serving a sentence of some sort—though whether or not Patmos was indeed a penal colony has been challenged of late by Leonard Thompson.¹⁰ Finally, it is worth noting that though John never cites a specific passage of Hebrew Scripture, Revelation is interlaced with repeated

is anachronistic to think that the illiterate masses who labored from sunup to sundown simply to survive would have had either the time or the intellectual proclivity to sit around with their social superiors and listen to biblical texts being read and discussed or to ask thoughtful questions about their content. It is even less likely that the early Christian house-churches, which as far as we know met only once a week, developed a system for training their illiterate members to memorize vast sections of the Jewish Scriptures, particularly when there is no mention of such a practice anywhere in the New Testament” (Christopher D. Stanley, “Paul's ‘Use’ of Scripture: Why the Audience Matters,” in *As it is Written: Studying Paul's Use of Scripture* [ed. S. Porter and C. Stanley; SBLSymS 50; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2008], 140). To this he adds the problem that the original audiences did not likely own copies of the Jewish Scriptures, and even if they did, without versification and modern tools like concordances, it would be difficult to track down each echo or reference to the Hebrew Scripture (Stanley, “Paul's ‘Use’ of Scripture,” 140–43). The same could be said of Revelation's audiences who lived in a similar region of the world as Paul's audiences and likely had a similar socio-economic makeup.

⁹ By intertextuality is simply meant John's intentional appeal to specific texts and passages and the possibility that he is quoting or echoing them to one degree or another.

¹⁰ Leonard L. Thompson, *The Book of Revelation: Apocalypse and Empire* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1990), 172.

use of Scripture, particularly the prophets. Whether someone who was not trained in the Jewish tradition would have been capable of recognizing John's facility with the Jewish Scriptures is doubtful. Nevertheless, it is clear that John projects himself as a Jewish prophet, writing at the end of the age, and writing to churches in urban settings, settings that—as mentioned below—contain both Jew and Gentile.

4.2. THE AUDIENCES OF REVELATION

Given the imposing nature of the imagery and language of the book of Revelation, complete with beasts, a dragon, a lake of fire, and the cataclysmic end of the world, it is easy to allow Revelation's "strangeness" to influence how one characterizes the audience that would have received the Apocalypse. For this reason, Leonard Thompson's demonstration of the *ordinary* nature of the lives of early Christians at large and the audiences of Revelation in particular is all the more important.¹¹ In constructing the audience of Revelation, he points to the urban nature of early Christian ecclesial structures as evidenced by Paul's letters, Ignatius's letters, and that John is writing to seven, large, urban cities.¹² Cities of Asia Minor contained considerable diversity, particularly regarding ethnicity. Each of the cities of the seven churches to which John writes had large Jewish populations,¹³ and, simultaneously, each also had the honor of being named *neokoros*—an official center of the imperial cult—at some point in the late first and early second centuries, an honor Ephesus was granted twice.¹⁴ The neokorate is significant because, as Slater explains,

¹¹ Leonard L. Thompson, "Ordinary Lives: John and His First Readers" in *Reading the Book of Revelation: A Resource for Students* (ed. D. Barr; Resources for Biblical Literature 44; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2003), 25–47 (esp. 38–41).

¹² Ephesus had a population of two hundred thousand, and Smyrna, Pergamum, and Sardis were each about half that (Thompson, "Ordinary Lives," 38). For early Christianity, see also Steven G. Wilson, *Related Strangers: Jews and Christians 70–170 C.E.* (Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 1995), 26.

¹³ For the Jewish population of Ephesus in particular, see the excellent study by Paul Trebilco, *The Early Christians in Ephesus from Paul to Ignatius* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004; repr., Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007), 37–51; for Asia Minor, see idem, *Jewish Communities in Asia Minor* (SNTSMS 69; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991). However, for a critique of Trebilco, see Mark Wilson, "The Early Christians in Ephesus and the Date of Revelation, Again," *Neot* 39 (2005): 163–93.

¹⁴ Thomas B. Slater, "On the Social Setting of the Revelation to John," *NTS* 44 (1998): 253. Cf. Price, 24–25; Ferguson, *The Religions of the Roman Empire* (Surrey: Thames & Hudson, 1970), 93–98.

it “symbolizes the civic pride and devotion to their religious traditions.”¹⁵ Because demographics of the Christian churches in urban centers were largely similar to that of the city itself, one can be sure that the churches receiving John’s letters were made up of people with diverse backgrounds and knowledge—some fully competent GR-minded readers and some fully competent Jewish-minded readers.¹⁶

The churches of Revelation, then, were likely similar to those Paul founded and to whom he wrote in the middle of the first century. Paul writes to Jew and Greek, slave and free, male and female (Gal 3:28). The author of the apocalypse does the same. Thompson summarizes the social setting of Revelation as follows:

Christianity was, thus, well established in Asia before John wrote to the seven churches. Christians in those churches reflected the diversity present in the cities. Slaves, those freed from slavery, and those born free, with or without spouses, joined men and women more and less financially successful in trades and possibly professions. In a rare instance, there even may have been a wealthy city magistrate. Ethnic diversity reflected the demographics of the cities, with a higher proportion of Jews in the churches than in the cities.¹⁷

While reconstructing a precise social setting of the churches of Revelation is not possible, accounting for some of the diversity that existed is. The present study attempts to account for the ethnic diversity of the churches to which John writes.

Robert Royalty has provocatively argued that John’s audience, due to its large number of Gentiles, was not capable of hearing all of the echoes of the Hebrew Scriptures that are indeed present in Revelation.¹⁸ He gives

¹⁵ Slater, “On the Social Setting of the Revelation,” 253.

¹⁶ Carolyn Osiek writes: “While Rome may have been the most ethnically diverse city of the ancient Mediterranean world because of its important place in immigration patterns, every urban center must have been characterized by ethnic and cultural diversity resulting from migration and trade. Christian communities could be expected to follow normal demographic patterns, except, of course, that there would be a proportionally larger representation of people of Jewish origin” (Carolyn Osiek, “House Churches and the Demographics of Diversity,” *RSR* 27 [2001]: 229). Regarding the proportion of Jews to Gentiles, Slater argues against Osiek, stating that “by the time Revelation was written, Christianity was a predominantly Gentile movement” (Slater, “On the Social Setting of the Revelation,” 251).

¹⁷ Thompson, “Ordinary Lives,” 39. For an almost identical description of the social setting of Revelation, see Robert M. Royalty Jr., *Streets of Heaven: The Ideology of Wealth in the Apocalypse of John* (Macon, Ga.: Mercer University Press, 1998), 19.

¹⁸ Royalty, *The Streets of Heaven*, 18. Christopher Stanley asks much the same questions as Royalty regarding the competence of the original audience, only he directs his

two reasons. First, John's urban, Gentile audience did not have the biblical literacy that John did. John's command of scriptural knowledge is staggering, and though he never once cites the texts to which he alludes, he appears to allude to Scripture at every turn. Second, even for those in the audience who had a command of the Scriptures, distinguishing John's use of it is notoriously difficult as evidenced by the firestorm in modern scholarship over the quantity and nature of these allusions. That he draws from Scripture is evident. But, as Royalty suggests, John appears to do so in a manner that "rewrites Daniel, Ezekiel, Isaiah, and Jeremiah" thus making it difficult for the modern reader (who has access to tools and texts not available to the original audience), much less the ancient reader, to figure out where the Hebrew Scripture leaves off and John begins.¹⁹

Royalty, whose interests lie in explicating motifs of wealth in Revelation, goes so far as to suggest that "ultimately, then, exegesis of the Hebrew Scriptures and the author's sources in Revelation directs us to a different context for interpretation of its wealth motifs that was much more accessible to its original audience than the intertextuality and allusiveness of the Apocalypse; that is, the world of Greco-Roman culture."²⁰ Royalty's analysis is significant for this study insofar as he legitimizes the role of the reader in the meaning-making process, he argues that the use of Greco-Roman literature as a backdrop for reading Revelation is a worthwhile endeavor, and he attempts to make sense of Revelation in light of how the text was heard by the audience who received it rather than as the text was intended to be heard ("implied reader"), is heard today (modern reader-response), was understood by the author (authorial intent), or some other hermeneutical agenda. Where this study parts ways with Royalty, however, is that it wishes to account for the possibility that there were members of John's audience who would have heard Revelation in light of the Jewish traditions that they had been taught and performed throughout their lives. Instead of assuming the whole of John's audience would have misunderstood his Apocalypse, a hypothesis that does not seem consistent with a church that includes a significant number of Jews, it is more appropriate to assume that the Jewish population of John's audience would have heard Revelation through Jewish tradition. Whether they

questions toward Paul's readers rather than Revelation's (Stanley, "Paul's 'Use' of Scripture," 125–55).

¹⁹ Royalty, *The Streets of Heaven*, 80.

²⁰ Royalty, *The Streets of Heaven*, 80.

would have heard every allusion to every biblical text is doubtful.²¹ What is more likely is that they would have been capable of interacting with Jewish tradition at a more general level. It is for this reason that this study approaches Revelation by collating Jewish (and Greco-Roman) traditions and backgrounds rather than taking an intertextual approach.

4.3. REVELATION 21–22 AS UTOPIAN VISION

Revelation 21 begins with the author relating his vision of a new heaven and a new earth: a new cosmos that contains no sea is the location of the Jerusalem that descends from heaven and is the dwelling place of God who now lives among humans. It is a place where death, tears, and pain are no more, a place where only the righteous are welcomed and the unrighteous are forbidden. In verse 9, the narrative shifts, and an angel leads the author to a mountain from which John describes the new Jerusalem as it comes down out of heaven. The city itself is said to be “the bride of the lamb,” and John uses terms like “glory” and “radiance” and symbols of wealth like gems and gold as descriptors of the city. The author is quite explicit in describing various aspects of the city. He notes: the material and size of the walls, the material and location of the gates, the material of the walls’ foundations, the size and foursquare shape of the city, and the material of the city’s streets. The city is clearly connected to the larger Jewish tradition when John states that the names of the twelve tribes of Israel are written on the twelve gates of the city, and it is also connected to Christian tradition in that the twelve foundations of the twelve walls are inscribed with the names of “the twelve apostles of the Lamb.” Finally, chapter 21 ends with a few remarks about what/who is or is not in the city: namely a temple is not to be found in the city, but the nations and their kings are; nothing unclean is to be found in the city, but those whose names are in the Lamb’s book of life are; light from the sun or moon is not in the city, but God’s glory is its light.

In chapter 22, the imagery shifts and the urban descriptors recede into the background as the author begins to use rural imagery. There is a river of the water of life that runs from the throne through the city. A tree of life is located in the midst of the city by the river, and John describes the

²¹ See the arguments of Stanley (“Paul’s ‘Use’ of Scripture,” 136–46) who argues convincingly for an original audience of Paul that is not as biblically literate as scholars often assume, particularly scholars who assume an “ideal reader.”

tree's fruit production and the healing property of its leaves. And finally, nothing accursed is found in the city, and the throne of God and the Lamb is the center of worship for all citizens of the new Jerusalem, who are stamped with the name of God on their foreheads.

From this brief overview of Rev 21:1–22:5, it is evident that the new Jerusalem has many utopian qualities as noted in chapter two and three of this present study. In order to examine the utopian expectations of John's Revelation, we will once again turn to the fourteen *topoi* as explicated in those chapters. Using the data collected there, Revelation 21–22 will be placed squarely within these utopian contexts. Though Revelation does not appeal to every *topos* mentioned below—wine and climate do not make an appearance as elements of John's utopian vision—Revelation 21–22 interacts with a remarkable number of the *topoi* listed. This fact indicates that the larger picture, i.e. the *topoi* seen as a whole, indeed constitutes an eschatological utopian portrait that resonates with a variety of traditions from the ancient world.

4.3.1. *Setting*

Revelation employs imagery from both urban and rural settings in order to convey its eschatological utopia. John begins with a lengthy description of the new Jerusalem, which descends from heaven, complete with fastidious details about the size of the walls, the shape and size of the city itself, the number of gates, and the materials from which the city is made. That his utopia is urban is significant. But perhaps even more interesting is that John concludes his description of the new Jerusalem with a series of rural images including a great river and trees concerning which he describes its fruit production and leaves. The result is a portrait of a garden city.

To the Jewish-minded auditor, John's utopian setting would be expected, both its urban and rural aspects. Certainly Jerusalem plays a key role in Jewish eschatological visions, and thus John's use of Jerusalem imagery would be heard quite naturally in the Jewish ear—after all, this is the new *Jerusalem*.²² But as we saw in chapter three, Jewish eschatological expectations often included an Edenic setting, and so

²² Though as Aune notes, there was a reluctance to call the eschatological or heavenly city "Jerusalem" (David E. Aune, *Revelation 17–22* [WBC 52c; Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 1998], 1121). He gives the example that Ezekiel 40–48 does not contain one usage of the name despite nineteen uses in chs. 1–39. Nevertheless, Ezekiel 40–48 describes the temple, an unmistakable clue concerning the location that is being referenced.

John's use of Edenic imagery (esp. tree of life; Rev 22:2) also would resonate with Jewish-minded auditors.²³ The combination of Jerusalem and Eden was a relatively common Jewish tradition (Ezekiel 47; 1 *Enoch* 24–25; 2 *Bar.* 4:1–7; *T. Dan.* 5:12).²⁴

John's use of Edenic imagery signals the reader that the paradise which God created for humans has once again been reopened, and the tree of life stands at the center of the city bidding all to come and partake of its fruit—the same fruit that caused God to remove Adam and Eve from the garden of Eden lest they eat from it and “live forever” (Gen 3:22). Even the mention of twelve angels standing guard at the twelve gates (Rev 21:12) reminds the reader of the cherubim who once watched over Eden (Gen 3:24; Ezek 28:14, 16).²⁵ It is important to note, however, that the new Jerusalem is not merely Eden *redivivus*. It is both garden and city, but not just any city. It is Jerusalem. And as such, it continues into eternity as an extension of the narrative of God's action in and to the people and place of Jerusalem.²⁶ Furthermore, in contrast to Greco-Roman primitivism that eschews urban life altogether, that the new Jerusalem is a city suggests an embrace of culture and human achievement, even if this city is said to descend from God himself.²⁷

The GR-minded reader, on the other hand, might be somewhat surprised to find utopia set in an urban environment. As we saw in chapter two, the vast majority of afterlife utopias (as well as primitivistic utopias) were set in rural environments. One need only think of the Islands of the

²³ The word *paradeisos* (παράδεισος) is used three times in the New Testament, always as a reference for Eden (Luke 23:43; 2 Cor 12:4; Rev 2:7). That John uses this term in the letters that begin his apocalypse doubtlessly presages the new Jerusalem's Edenic qualities. For the New Testament's use of *paradise*, see Grant Macaskill, “Paradise in the New Testament,” in *Paradise in Antiquity: Jewish and Christian Views* (ed. M. Bockmuehl and G. Stroumsa; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), 64–81 (esp. 74–81 for paradise in Revelation).

²⁴ Ryan S. Schellenberg, “Seeing the World Whole: Intertextuality and the New Jerusalem (Revelation 21–22),” *PRS* 33 (2006): 475.

²⁵ Aune notes too the cherubim that decorate the Solomonian temple (1 Kgs 6:29–35; 2 Chr 3:7) including the temple doors perhaps indicating “their role as the mythical guardians of the garden of God” (Aune, *Revelation* 17–22, 1155).

²⁶ Stephens even suggests that “the reappearance of Eden/paradise involves an escalated fulfillment, in which the *Endzeit*, though patterned on the *Urzeit*, surpasses it in overwhelming measure” (Mark B. Stephens, *Annihilation or Renewal?* [WUNT 2.307; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011], 252; cf. Pilchan Lee, *The New Jerusalem in the Book of Revelation: A Study of Revelation 21–22 in the Light of its Background in Jewish Tradition* (WUNT 129; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2001), 290).

²⁷ Similarly, Richard Bauckham, *The Theology of the Book of Revelation* (New Testament Theology; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 135.

Blessed, the Elysian fields, or the primitivistic utopian islands to quickly get the sense that utopia was supposed to be hidden from city life.²⁸ Even those Romans living in urban environments decorated their homes with green spaces meant to emulate a rural, paradisiacal environment.²⁹ And perhaps this is what a GR-minded auditor would have heard when John rural-izes the new Jerusalem by adding a river and greenery to its main fairway. Depending on how sympathetic the GR-minded auditor was to John's vision and prophetic ministry, it is quite possible that he or she might entirely reject the urban nature of the vision opting instead to focus on the rural imagery. One example of an early document doing just that is the *Apocalypse of Peter*, a second-century text that contains a good deal of information about the blessed afterlife, all of which is rural and Edenic, none of which is urban (*Apoc. Pet.* 14 ff.).³⁰ There is neither mention of a city nor of Jerusalem. On the other hand, there are clear Greco-Roman elements, most distinctly a mention of the field of Acherusia and Elysium (*Apoc. Pet.* 14). This text, then, appears to emphasize the Greco-Roman elements of the utopian afterlife and downplay Jewish elements.³¹

²⁸ In chapter two is mentioned one important exception to the lack of interest in cities in Greco-Roman afterlife utopias: Lucian's satirical description of the Island of the Blessed (*Ver. hist.* 2.5–29), a description that contains both a city and the Elysian fields, both urban and rural settings. The similarities between Lucian's utopia and Revelation's utopia do not end there. Both include gold as the primary building material of the city; precious stones make up the walls or foundations of the cities; the ground/streets are of valuable material; there is a strange description of the gates (enormous pearls/enormous cinnamon sticks); there is no darkness; rivers and trees play important roles in both cities; and the trees are explicitly said to produce fruit twelve months out of the year. All of these similarities lead Peter von Möllendorff to argue that Lucian directly parodies Revelation, a position that is presently the minority position on the matter. Nevertheless, that Lucian is the first Greco-Roman author to place the afterlife in an urban setting provides fodder for von Möllendorff's argument. For the argument, see Peter von Möllendorff, *Auf der Suche nach der verlorenen Wahrheit: Lukians Wahre Geschichten* (Tübingen: G. Narr Verlag, 2000), 17–22, 318–21; idem, "Christian Apocalypses and Their Mimetic Potential in Pagan Education: A Contribution Concerning Lucian's *True History*" (*Reading the Bible Intertextually*; ed. R. Hays, S. Alkier, and L. Huizenga; Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2008), 157–69. See also the critique by Philipp Wälchli, *Studien zu den literarischen Beziehungen zwischen Plutarch und Lukian ausgehend von Plutarch: De genio Socratis und Lukian: Philopseudeis* (Munich: K. G. Saur, 2003), 22–23.

²⁹ Annette Lucia Giesecke, "Beyond the Garden of Epicurus: The Utopics of the Ideal Roman Villa," *Utopian Studies* 12 (2001): 27.

³⁰ It should be noted that the extant texts are in Akhmimic and Ethiopic, and they diverge from one another regularly. Nevertheless, their descriptions of the blessed afterlife are similar, and neither contains a reference to the new Jerusalem.

³¹ For example, the description of the blessed afterlife is said to be a garden that contains sweet-smelling trees and fruit. Interesting, however, is that the tree of life is not mentioned, nor are any elements that necessarily identify this garden as the garden of Eden.

Perhaps John's GR-minded original audience would have done something similar by emphasizing the Edenic qualities of John's vision and spiritualizing the urban.

Though the GR-minded reader would likely be startled that John places his afterlife utopia in a city, the same reader would likely feel at home with regard to John's presentation of this city due to the common rhetorical practice of *laus urbis* (the praise of a city).³² Strangely, biblical scholarship has largely ignored this facet of the new Jerusalem's description.³³ It is, therefore, worth quoting at length from the rhetorician Quintilian who takes up the topic of *laus urbis*.³⁴ One should immediately see connections between his direction and how John describes the new Jerusalem:

Instead, the afterlife garden fits just as comfortably within Greco-Roman traditions as it does Jewish. Further, there is a clear anti-Jewish bias in the work as evidenced by Jesus' telling of the parable of the fig tree in which the author clearly states that the fig tree that is to be uprooted is clearly designated as the "house of Israel" (*Apoc. Pet. 2*).

³² The subject of *laus urbis* is not raised in chapter two because the practice of praising a city should not be equated with describing a utopia. Instead, it is merely a literary and rhetorical technique. Thus, one might be able to praise a city for a variety of reasons while at the same time believing that this same city is in no way one's utopian desire. Knowledge of the practice stems from two kinds of sources: 1. Rhetoricians who guide one in this technique (Quintilian, *Inst.*, 3.7.26–28; Menander Rhetor, *Rhet.* 1.346.27–351.19; Theon, *Prog.* 53–55); 2. The technique as practiced in extant writings (e.g. Diodorus Siculus gives lengthy descriptions of cities, including Thebes and Babylon, that seem to employ much of Quintilian's advice [cf. Diodorus Siculus, 1.45.4–46.2; 2.7.1–10.6; for a "praise" of Jerusalem, see *Let. Aris.* 51–120]). For an example of the latter, see David L. Balch, "Two Apologetic Encomia: Dionysius on Rome and Josephus on the Jews," *JSJ* 13 [1982]: 102–22.

³³ For a few who recognized the presence of *laus Urbis* in Revelation 21–22, see Ben Witherington, *Revelation*, 265–66; Balch, "Two Apologetic Encomia," 102–22; Royalty, *Streets of Heaven*, 111–18 (though, unfortunately, he fails to mention Quintilian in his assessment). Not one of the monographs on Revelation 21–22 interacts with or recognize the *laus urbis* tradition. This is most surprising of Sim and Georgi, both of whose work centers around comparing the new Jerusalem to Hellenistic models of city planning (Unyong Sim, *Das Himmlische Jerusalem in Apk. 21,1–22,5 im Kontext biblisch-jüdischer Tradition und antiken Städtebaus* [Bochumer Altertumswissenschaftliches Colloquium 25; Trier: Wissenschaftlicher Verlag, 1996]; Dieter Georgi, "John's 'Heavenly' Jerusalem," in *The City in the Valley: Biblical Interpretation and Urban Theology* (SBL 7; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2005), 161–86 (esp. 181); trans. of "Die Visionen vom himmlischen Jerusalem in Apk 21 und 22," in *Kirche: Festschrift für Günther Bornkamm zum 75. Geburtstag* (ed. D. Lührman and G. Strecker; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1980), 351–72. None of the following interact with this tradition either: Mathewson, *A New Heaven and a New Earth*; Lee, *The New Jerusalem*; Eva Maria Rapp, *The Metaphor of the City in the Apocalypse of John* (Studies in Biblical Literature 67; New York: Peter Lang, 2004).

³⁴ Menander has a longer and more descriptive account of the praise of cities. Nevertheless, Quintilian is quoted for two reasons: 1. Quintilian can be dated to the first century C.E. while Menander dates to the fourth century C.E. 2. Quintilian's account is smaller and more manageable making the similarities with Revelation 21–22 all the more striking. Balch argues that the conservative nature of rhetorical training would suggest that, despite Menander's late dating, his rhetorical teaching would have been, and indeed was, the same

Cities are praised on similar lines to men. The founder stands for the father, age gives authority (as with peoples said to be autochthonous), and the virtues and vices seen in actions are the same as with individuals, the only special features being those which come from the site and the fortifications. Citizens are a credit to cities as children are to parents.

Public works also can be praised; here magnificence, use, beauty, and the builder are usually considered; magnificence, for example, in temples, use in walls, beauty or the builder in both. There are also Encomia of places, like that of Sicily in Cicero, in which we have an eye both to beauty and to use: beauty in the coasts, in level plains and pleasant scenery; use in healthy or fertile locations. (Quintilian, *Inst.* 3.7.26–27 [Russell, LCL])

This passage picks up after Quintilian describes how one ought to praise persons, which he uses as a point of comparison for how to praise a city. He begins by noting the importance of the founder of the city giving particular attention to the founder's age. The new Jerusalem, of course, is not only said to come down from heaven but is "from God" (ἀπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ; 21:2) suggesting that this city is indeed founded by God—an idea also present in Heb 11:10: "For he looked forward to the city that has foundations, whose architect and builder is God."³⁵ And that God is not autochthonous, i.e. born from the earth and thus without parent, is not problematic for the auditor, because God is even greater—he is "the Alpha and the Omega, the beginning and the end" (Rev 21:6). By mentioning God's "age" and role as the new Jerusalem's founder would certainly have been high praise.

As for the "site and the fortifications," John notes that this city originates in heaven and descends and is seated in the world's most holy site, Jerusalem. Furthermore, the walls of the city are said to be "great" and "high" and are described at length (Rev 21:12–21),³⁶ and twelve angels sit at the gates keeping watch over the city.³⁷ Further, Quintilian notes that the citizens are a credit to the city, presumably through their virtue, a

as that in the first century (Balch, "Two Apologetic Encomia," 102–22). Though he tries to prove this by showing that Dionysius and Josephus appear to use rhetoric similarly to Menander, one remains on much firmer footing with Quintilian.

³⁵ See Mounce who compares the new Jerusalem's founding with Heb 11:10 (*Book of Revelation*, 370).

³⁶ Though Revelation itself claims its walls are high, it also states that it is one hundred and forty-four cubits which most commentators agree is quite small given the dimensions of the city.

³⁷ It is possible that the Jewish-minded reader would hear Isa 62:6: "Upon your walls, O Jerusalem, I have posted sentinels" (cf. Mounce, *The Book of Revelation*, 378; Smalley, *Revelation*, 548–49; Mathewson, *A New Heaven and a New Earth*, 198). In this way, the angels would act as watchmen, perhaps in a similar manner as the cherubim who guard Eden in Gen 3:24 (cf. Ezek 28:14; 2 En. 8.8; *T. Levi* 18.10). In 1 Kgs 6:23–38, cherubim are etched into the temple itself keeping watch over the holy of holies.

point John stresses by noting the removal of all vice from the new Jerusalem (21:8). The new Jerusalem not only contains virtuous people but is a place where the “kings of the earth” will gravitate toward at the time of its arrival bringing their glories and the glory of the nations into that place (21:24, 26).

Quintilian also notes the importance of the beauty and function of the city mentioning, in particular, the walls of the city. John, of course, uses precious materials (traditional markers of beauty) to describe the walls (jasper), its foundations (twelve kinds of precious stone), the city (gold), and even the streets (also gold; Rev 21:18–21). Finally, as for its “use,” Quintilian specifically mentions the importance of health and fertility in the city. The new Jerusalem contains a spring with “living water” (21:6), a river of “living water” (22:1–2), and trees that produce fruit all year long, the leaves of which are capable of healing (22:2). It could not be more healthy!

Given the degree to which John’s description of the new Jerusalem abides by Quintilian’s rhetorical advice for the praise of cities, it is difficult to understand how more scholars have not made this connection. Many of John’s readers, both Jewish- and GR-minded, likely would have familiarity with the art of rhetoric (even if it was learned outside of a traditional classroom) and would have been exposed to the art of praising a city. For this reason, it is highly likely that many of John’s auditors would have heard Revelation 21–22 as a *laus urbis*.

4.3.2. *Wealth*

John’s depiction of the new Jerusalem is filled with images of wealth. In Rev 21:2, the city is said to be a “bride adorned for her husband.” The adornments of this bride are second to none. The basic materials of the city, its walls, and even its streets, are of precious gems and gold. And the gates of the twelve entryways, three on each side of the foursquare city, are made of a single, large pearl wrapping around the entire city, as if the city itself is adorned with a pearl necklace.

The extravagant use of wealth imagery in the new Jerusalem stands in contrast to many Jewish expectations regarding wealth that are much more condemnatory, or at least critical, of such gaudy displays.³⁸ Added

³⁸ For example, the author of *Sib. Or.* 2:114–118: “Gold and silver are always a deception for men. Life-destroying gold, originator of evils, crushing all things, would that you were not a desired affliction for men, for because of you are battles, plunderings, murders,

to that, and perhaps more important, is the seeming hypocrisy within Revelation itself on account of Babylon being judged for its display of wealth (chapters 17–18) while the new Jerusalem is exalted despite, and even by means of, its display of wealth. The most egregious example of this seeming hypocrisy is Rev 17:4 and 18:16 in which the “whore of Babylon” is twice said to be “adorned with gold and jewels and pearls,” the same precious materials with which the “bride” of the new Jerusalem is adorned.³⁹ But is such hypocrisy real or only apparent? And how would John’s auditors have heard his use of wealth imagery?

John’s Jewish-minded audience likely would have heard John interacting with four traditions that shape his use of wealth in the new Jerusalem: the explicit expectation that the new Jerusalem would be built of precious materials, Edenic imagery in Revelation 21–22 especially the twelve precious stones, the eschatological *Völkerwallfahrt* or pilgrimage of the nations, and the great reversal—the notion that the have-nots in this life will be the haves in the next. The evidence suggests that it is this fourth tradition, the great reversal, that stands as a metanarrative behind much of what John says throughout the book of Revelation culminating in his vision of the new Jerusalem where those who have conquered despite hardship will be given their eternal reward. The traditions will be addressed in the order mentioned above.

As noted in chapter three, there were a variety of Jewish traditions regarding proper attitudes toward wealth.⁴⁰ And despite the presence of some Jewish traditions that perceived of wealth as inherently evil, other Jewish traditions existed that would have mitigated the problem of wealth in the new Jerusalem.⁴¹ Most obvious is the tradition that the new Jerusalem would be built of precious materials, the *Vorbild* of which is almost certainly Isa 54:11–12: “O afflicted one, storm-tossed, and not comforted,

children hostile to their parents and brothers to their kindred.” In light of this tradition, the gold that plates the streets of the new Jerusalem would likely not be welcomed.

³⁹ For a helpful comparison of the Greek texts of Rev 17:1–19:10 and Rev 21:9–22:9, see Aune, *Revelation 17–22*, 1144–45. The identical verbal parallels that exist between the two make it unmistakable that the author consciously sets these two cities, Babylon and the new Jerusalem, in comparison with one another.

⁴⁰ Interestingly, John does not seem to engage Jewish traditions that condemn the abuse of wealth, traditions noted in chapter three. This is certainly interesting if not somewhat problematic.

⁴¹ Besides the references to a new Jerusalem built of precious metals, it is also worth noting that both Solomon’s temple (1 Kgs 5:1–8:66) and the Herodian temple (Josephus, *J.W.* 5.201–214) are described as decorated in gold, silver, and other precious materials. For the new Jerusalem as a temple city, see below under *topos* “Temple.”

I am about to set your stones in antimony, and lay your foundations with sapphires. I will make your pinnacles of rubies, your gates of jewels, and all your wall of precious stones.” Tobit 13:16 expands this:

For Jerusalem will be built as his house for all ages. How happy I will be if a remnant of my descendants should survive to see your glory and acknowledge the King of heaven. The gates of Jerusalem will be built with sapphire and emerald, and all your walls with precious stones. The towers of Jerusalem will be built with gold, and their battlements with pure gold. The streets of Jerusalem will be paved with ruby and with stones of Ophir.⁴²

Ophir is almost certainly “gold” making Tobit’s description of the new Jerusalem quite similar to that of John’s.⁴³ John’s Jewish-minded auditors, then, would have understood Revelation 21–22 to be standing within this tradition that uses wealth imagery as a means of showing the greatness of the eschatological Jerusalem.⁴⁴

Revelation 21–22 also appeals to wealth imagery as it appears in Edenic traditions, especially the traditions of the stones of Eden found in Ezekiel 27–28 and Pseudo-Philo. The twelve stones mentioned in Rev 21:19–20 have been given considerable attention and two texts are typically cited as possible parallels: Exod 28:15–21 and the jewels as seated on the breast plate of the high priest, and Ezek 28:13 where are found in an Edenic description, and ultimate condemnation, of Tyre.⁴⁵ Beate Kowalski has argued that John’s use of wealth imagery should be set in light of the condemnation of Tyre in Ezekiel 27–28.⁴⁶ In Ezekiel, Tyre is described

⁴² Cf. 11QTemple XXXVI, 11; XXXIX, 3; XLI, 15. Royalty, *Streets of Heaven*, 73–74; Fekkes, *Isaiah and Prophetic Traditions*, 238–53; Aune, *Revelation 17–22*, 1164; G. K. Beale, *The Book of Revelation: A Commentary on the Greek Text* (NIGTC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999), 1082–87.

⁴³ Royalty, *Streets of Heaven*, 74.

⁴⁴ Royalty recognizes this tradition but critiques John for not choosing other traditions that describe the new Jerusalem in terms other than wealth (*Streets of Heaven*, 74). This is part of Royalty’s larger argument that John is not critical enough of the empire’s abuse of wealth and power.

⁴⁵ W. W. Reader, “The Twelve Jewels of Revelation 21:19–20: Tradition History and Modern Interpretation,” *JBL* 100 [1981]: 433–57. Other ancient texts include lists of the twelve stones: Josephus, *J.W.* 5.5.7; *Ant.* 3.7.5; Philo, *Leg.* 1.81–82; Ps.-Philo, *L.A.B.* 26.10–11. Reader also notes Targumic and Rabbinic traditions that associate the twelve tribes with gems (440–44).

⁴⁶ Beate Kowalski, *Die Rezeption des Propheten Ezechiel in der Offenbarung des Johannes* (SBB 52; Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 2004), 408–26. She particularly argues that other passages that contain the jewels mentioned in Rev 21:19–20 (esp. Ex 28:6–30) do not fit her definition of allusion. Fekkes states that most scholars see a primary allusion to the breastplate of the high priest in Ex 28:15–21 but, like Kowalski, questions whether Ezekiel should instead be the primary point of allusion based on similar wording in Rev 21:19 and

with much of the imagery used to describe Babylon in Revelation 17–18 (esp. 18:11–13): gold, silver, linen, purple, scented wood, ivory, bronze, iron, etc.⁴⁷ Similarly, the king of Tyre in Ezek 28:13 (LXX)⁴⁸ is said to be set with most of the jewels mentioned as part of the foundation stones for the new Jerusalem.⁴⁹ Kowalski concludes that the author of Revelation is alluding to Tyre as described in Ezekiel in both his description of Babylon (Rev 17–18) and his description of the new Jerusalem (particularly Rev 21:19–20). The former allusion, however, is what she calls an analogous reception (“Analoge Rezeption”) while the latter is an antithetical reception (“Antithetische Rezeption”), meaning John’s description of the wealth of Babylon should be read analogously with Ezekiel’s condemnation of Tyre, but the new Jerusalem should be read as an antithetical allusion.⁵⁰ She is right, and such antithesis works well within the author’s larger narrative of great reversal (see below).

In concert with the allusion to Ezekiel in Rev 21:19–20, the twelve stones mentioned here would likely have had Edenic overtones. In Ezek 28:13, the stones are set as the covering of the king of Tyre, here an Adamic figure that is said to have been “in Eden, the garden of God.”⁵¹ The tradition between these stones and paradise, however, are farther reaching than simply Ezekiel. For instance, Pseudo-Philo’s *Biblical Antiquities* contains a considerable amount of information about the stones: they originate from Havilah (a land mentioned near Eden in Gen 2:11–12; *L.A.B.* 25:11), they are preserved in the ark of the covenant (and thus linked to the temple;

Ezek 28:13 (see Jan Fekkes III, “‘His Bride Has Prepared Herself’: Revelation 19–21 and Isaian Nuptial Imagery,” *JBL* 109 [1990]: 277).

⁴⁷ See also Royalty, *Streets of Heaven*, 63–65.

⁴⁸ The MT only mentions nine stones.

⁴⁹ Reader, “The Twelve Jewels,” 433–57.

⁵⁰ Kowalski, *Die Rezeption des Propheten Ezechiel*, 425–26. See also Beale who notes that “pseudo-Philo, like John, draws a contrast between an idolatrous figure adorned with stones and a righteous figure” (Beale, *Book of Revelation*, 1088; cf. Reader, “Twelve Jewels,” 456). To this should be added Kowalski’s point that Ezekiel 28 also contains an idolatrous figure and thus acts as a suitable parallel to John’s use of the jewel tradition. For more on the link between John and Pseudo-Philo, see the following paragraph.

⁵¹ As Patmore argues, though rabbinic authors typically cast this figure as Adam, the church fathers (notably Tertullian, *Against Marcion* 2.10) cast him as Satan (Hector M. Patmore, “Adam or Satan? The Identity of the King of Tyre in Late Antiquity,” in *After Ezekiel: Essays on the Reception of a Difficult Prophet* [ed. P.M. Joyce and A. Mein; London: T&T Clark, 2011], 59–69). Patmore notes, however, that the reading of the church fathers works only if one reads Ezekiel 28 in light of the New Testament, especially Luke 10:18 and 1 John 3:8.

L.A.B. 26.12), and they will be revealed again in the eschaton (*L.A.B.* 13–15).⁵² Therefore, according to Jewish tradition, these jewels appear in primeval Eden, on the breastplate of the high priest, in the ark of the covenant, and they will reappear in the eschaton when paradise is reopened; therefore, as Beale also recognizes, the jewels are a perfect fit for John's new Jerusalem which is simultaneously Eden and temple.⁵³

The third tradition that would have resonated with John's Jewish-minded auditor is the notion that the nations will pilgrimage to Jerusalem in the eschaton. This tradition is prevalent in the Hebrew Scripture and early Judaism and likely stands at the heart of John's statement in *Rev* 21:24–26: "The nations will walk by its light, and the kings of the earth will bring their glory into it. Its gates will never be shut by day—and there will be no night there. People will bring into it the glory and the honor of the nations." As Mathewson rightly notes: "The expectation in the Psalms and prophetic literature that Zion would become the center of a universal *Völkerwallfahrt* apparently included two different, though related, strands: (1) bringing gifts and tributes to Jerusalem, contributing to its restoration; (2) coming to Jerusalem to worship Yahweh (or a combination of both)."⁵⁴ Though both are of interest to *Revelation* 21–22, it is primarily the first strand that interests the *topos* of "Wealth."

Of the numerous passages that could be appealed to for support, *Isaiah* 60 is exemplary and a few motifs that appear in *Rev* 21:24–26. A comparison of *Revelation* 21:24–26 and parts of *Isaiah* 60, therefore, is instructive:

⁵² See Richard Bauckham, "Paradise in the *Biblical Antiquities* of Pseudo-Philo," in *Paradise in Antiquity* (eds. M. Bockmuehl and G. Stroumsa; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), 44–47.

⁵³ Beale, *Book of Revelation*, 1088. Beale also mentions a host of later rabbinic connections between the jewels and Eden in the form of "wedding canopies" meant for Adam and Eve (*Revelation*, 1087). For more on the new Jerusalem as temple, see below under *topos* "Temple."

⁵⁴ Mathewson, *A New Heaven and a New Earth*, 165; cf. Joachim Jeremias, *Jesus' Promise to the Nations* (tr. S. H. Hooke; London: SCM Press, 1958), 55–62; Terence L. Donaldson, "Proselytes or 'Righteous Gentiles'? The Status of Gentiles in Eschatological Pilgrimage Patterns of Thought," *JSP* 7 (1990): 3–28; Allan J. McNicol, *The Conversion of the Nations* (LNTS 438; New York: T&T Clark, 2011). See also below under *topos* "Citizens: Inclusivism/Exclusivism." For examples of the former, see 1 Kgs 10.23–25; Pss 68.29; 72.9–11; Isa 18.7; 60.5–6; 61.5–6; 66.12; Hag 2.6–9; Tob 13.11; 2 Macc. 5.16; Josephus, *J.W.* 5.187; *Ant.* 15.402; *Sib. Or.* 3.772–773. For examples of the latter: Pss 22.27–29; 47.7–9; 86.9; 102.21–22; 122.3–4; 138.4–5; Isa 21.4; 11.10–12; 49.22–23; 56.5–8; 60.3–17; 66.18, 23; Jer 3.17; Mic 4.1–2; Zeph 3.10; Zech 8.20–23; 14.16–17; *Sib. Or.* 3.710–731; *T. Ben.* 9.2; *Pss. Sol.* 17.30–35.

Revelation 21

v. 24a “The nations will walk by its light”

v. 24b “and the kings of the earth will bring their glory into it”

v. 25a “Its gates will never be shut by day”

v. 25b “and there will be no night there”

v. 26 “People will bring into it the glory and honor of the nations”

Isaiah 60

v. 3a “Nations shall come to your light”

v. 3b “and kings to the brightness of your dawn

v. 11a “Your gates shall always be open”

v. 11b “day and night they shall not be shut”

v. 11c “so that nations shall bring you their wealth, with their kings led in procession”

v. 13 “The glory of Lebanon shall come to you, the cypress, the plane, and the pine, to beautify the place of my sanctuary”

As one can see, Isaiah 60 serves as an important parallel to Rev 21:24–26, and, based on the verbal similarities and order of presentation, an argument could be made that Rev 21:24–26 intentionally alludes to the utopian vision of Isaiah 60.⁵⁵ It is important to note that, for the Jewish-minded reader who recalls this Isaianic passage, John’s “glory and honor of the nations” in 21:26 would register as a reference to Isaiah’s “wealth of nations,” which appears twice in Isaiah 60 (vv. 5, 11). The author of Isaiah 60 speaks at length about other nations, and in Isa 60:13, Lebanon’s “glory” is explicitly mentioned and clearly defined as the one material possession this nation is most known for: its wood (“the cypress, the plane, and the pine”).⁵⁶ The “wealth of nations,” then, is not *necessarily* a reference to gold, silver or precious materials, it can be anything that makes a country great: for Lebanon that is wood, for Midian and Ephah camels (Isa 60:6),

⁵⁵ Fekkes does not argue that Rev 21:24–26 as a whole is an allusion to Isaiah 60, but he does argue that pieces of this passage from Revelation are an allusion (*Isaiah and Prophetic Traditions*, 269–73). Most importantly, he rightly recognizes that John’s reference to “no night” in the new Jerusalem has stronger parallels to Zech 14:7 than to Isa 60:11 (cf. Aune, *Revelation 17–22*, 1172; Prigent, *Commentary on the Apocalypse*, 484). Jauhainen, who attempts to use the language of allusion and echo with clarity, clarifies that John does not “allude” to Zech 14:7 but “echoes” it, a lower level of intentionality (Jauhainen, *The Use of Zechariah in Revelation*, 121–22).

⁵⁶ Lebanon is typically known for its cedar, which the LXX mentions instead of the plane (elm), and the wood of Lebanon is its “glory.” Cf. Judg 9:15; 2 Kgs 19:23; Pss 29:5; 104:16; Song 5:15; Isa 2:13; 14:8; 37:24; Jer 22:23.

for Sheba gold and frankincense (60:6), for Kedar flocks (60:7), and for Nebaioth rams (60:7). Nevertheless, silver and gold are no doubt part of this “glory” and “wealth of nations” too (60:7).

In light of Isaiah 60, it is quite likely that a Jewish-minded reader of Rev 21:24–26 would have the *Völkerwallfahrt* tradition in mind along with its concomitant view that, not only the nations themselves, but also the wealth of the nations (defined as that product for which a nation is most known) will be brought to the eschatological Jerusalem. The idea is that the once undignified and oppressed will be worthy of the best this world has to offer in the eschatological utopia, an idea to which we now turn.⁵⁷

Zechariah 14:14 is an example of the way in which the *Völkerwallfahrt* tradition can serve the end of the great reversal: “And the wealth of all the surrounding nations shall be collected—gold, silver, and garments in great abundance.” Zechariah 14 demonstrates that sometimes the eschatological pilgrimage, in which the nations bring their “glory”—here it is clearly wealth—to Jerusalem, serves the goal of a reversal of fortunes in the eschaton. The new Jerusalem of Revelation stands firmly in such a tradition, in light of which, one would expect the eschaton to be a place of great wealth for those who experienced poverty in this life. This is, of course, exactly what one finds in Revelation 21–22.

The metanarrative of great reversal serves as a lens through which John views the world and through which he encourages his readers to see the world. One of the primary foils John uses as exemplary of such a mindset is wealth. The rich are poor and the poor are rich. In this way, Royalty is right to argue that John is not as critical of wealth as Jewish tradition typically is.⁵⁸ Nevertheless, Royalty goes too far.⁵⁹ Royalty’s argument

⁵⁷ Terence Donaldson argues that the eschatological pilgrimage is, in fact, only a part of a larger tradition, what he calls “Zion eschatology,” which includes a great reversal. He writes, “Central to this pattern is the hope that ‘on that day,’ the lamentable conditions of Israel’s present existence—dispersion among the Gentiles, oppression by foreign nations, unfaithfulness to the covenant within Israel—will be reversed. Israel’s enemies will be routed, Jerusalem/Zion will be glorified, the scattered exiles will stream back to Zion, where they will enjoy a life of peace and prosperity, and the universal rule of YHWH and/or his Anointed One will be inaugurated” (Donaldson, “Proselytes or ‘Righteous Gentiles,’” 7). See his footnotes for the primary sources he uses to back each part of this claim.

⁵⁸ See chapter three for the critical nature of certain strands of Jewish tradition. See also Royalty, *Streets of Heaven*, 78–79, 246.

⁵⁹ For example, he writes, “The more one reads Jewish literature with an eye for passages about wealth and trade, the more striking it is that nowhere in the Apocalypse is there any strong concern for social justice, the poor, the widowed, or the orphaned” (*Streets of Heaven*, 78). As for concern for the marginalized, Royalty would have been served to note the mention of slaves in the list of Roman cargo in Rev 18:13.

is that John's use of empire ideals, especially regarding wealth, is tacit approval of their power structure and the abuses therein.⁶⁰ But John's point, nor the point his audience would have heard, has anything to do with power structures or critiques of wealth. The point is much simpler. John's use of wealth imagery functions symbolically in his dualistic narrative of the great reversal and ironically says very little about his attitude toward wealth. Royalty is right in that Revelation does not offer a careful critique of the abuse of power and wealth, but to criticize the Apocalypse for this is to criticize it for not doing something it never intended to do.

John's critique of wealth is tied to the larger narrative that stands behind the apocalypse, a narrative that claims that this world is upside-down; black is white, up is down, and, most importantly, rich is poor. To those who have something in this life (e.g. the Laodiceans, those of Babylon), John offers warnings. And to those who have nothing in this life (e.g. the Smyrnans, Philadelphians, the martyrs) John offers the full treasure of the next life.⁶¹ John shares the worldview of the author of 2 *Baruch*: "Therefore, nothing of the present things should come into your heart, but they should, on the contrary, be expected, since that which was promised will come. And we should not look upon the delights of the present nations, but let us think about that which has been promised to us regarding the end" (2 *Bar.* 83.4–5). In the same way, John's message throughout appeals to the idea that though one may experience strife and difficulty in this life, God's promises apply to the next life.⁶²

⁶⁰ Royalty has gone so far as to argue that, ultimately, John does not attempt to criticize or reform the *culture* of Rome and possible abuses of wealth therein (a culture that Jews and Gentiles alike criticize for its decadence [cf. Lucian, *Nigrinus* 14–16; *Streets of Heaven*, 111–24]) but instead attacks Rome's sources of power; i.e. it is simply a matter of the wrong people/beings being in power (*Streets of Heaven*, esp. 246). He writes, "In conclusion, this study has shown that opposition to the dominant culture in the Apocalypse is not an attempt to redeem that culture but rather an attempt to replace it with a Christianized version of the same thing.... The text creates a new culture of power that mimics the dominant ideology; only the names and labels are changed" (*Streets of Heaven*, 246). To a degree, this reading is in keeping with John's metanarrative of the great reversal (i.e. that positions of power will be swapped in the life to come).

⁶¹ James Resseguie uniquely offers a narratival approach to the book of Revelation using categories such as setting, plot, character, etc., to structure its chapters. Unfortunately, he fails to address the characterization of the rich and the poor in Revelation, a task that would have borne fruit. Cf. James L. Resseguie, *Revelation Unsealed: A Narrative Critical Approach to John's Apocalypse* (BIS 32; Leiden: Brill, 1998).

⁶² Whether or not this makes for good theology is debatable. Nevertheless, it is John's worldview.

The great reversal, then, plays a key role in this narrative because eventually the world will be restored to its proper order, but in the meantime one must “soldier on.” Indeed this modern phrase is apt for Revelation since John frequently uses battle language—i.e. “conquer” (νικᾶω)—as a way of describing one’s mission for this life and the requirement for entrance into the next (Rev 21:7).⁶³ To those who conquer, life will be made right in the new Jerusalem. This expectation is stated repeatedly throughout the letters, which contain seven uses of the verb νικᾶω, most of which are followed by a promise that has a parallel to the description of the new Jerusalem.⁶⁴ John’s use of wealth language throughout Revelation acts as a visual metaphor explicating the change that is expected. That the new Jerusalem contains much of the wealth imagery used to describe Babylon, therefore, would have been heard as part of this reversal narrative.

For the GR-minded auditor, the great reversal is a part of their eschatological repertoire too. Lucian and others lament the accumulation of wealth among the wealthiest while the poorest go hungry.⁶⁵ Therefore, the GR-minded auditor, in light of the context of the entirety of Revelation, would likely hear a similar metanarrative to that described above for the Jewish-minded auditor. The poor and oppressed in this life should have hope because the life to come is filled with blessings. The wealthy in this life, however, should be on guard because their wealth may ultimately lead to their demise.⁶⁶

Furthermore, reading Revelation 21–22 through a Greco-Roman grid leads to a unique finding about the nature of the new Jerusalem’s wealth. The evidence from chapter two found that wealth can be present in utopia, and, when it is, one should expect that wealth to be used in a specific

⁶³ John uses the term νικᾶω a total of fifteen times in his apocalypse, both in the letters and in the narrative.

⁶⁴ For example, the “conquerors” from Ephesus are given access to the tree of life and the paradise of God (2:7); Smyrna’s conquerors are not hurt by the second death (2:11); Sardis is given white robes and a place in the book of life (3:5); Philadelphians have a place in the new Jerusalem (3:12); and the Laodiceans are given the chance to sit on the throne of Jesus, perhaps that throne that sits in the middle of the city in Rev 22:3 (3:21).

⁶⁵ See, for example, Lucian’s *Saturnalia*, which is a sustained treatise on the gap between the rich and poor.

⁶⁶ It is worth noting that, as with Jewish traditions concerning wealth, there is a strong Greco-Roman tradition that suggests any form of material wealth is an evil. Thus Plato’s utopia as stated in his *Laws* bans the accumulation of gold, silver, and precious materials. Similarly, Ovid states that it was the when humans began to dig for gold and precious materials that war entered the world (*Metam.* 1.137–144; for wealth as a cause of the degeneration of society, see also Plato, *Laws* 678D–679E; Justin, *Hist. Phil. epit.* 2.2; Ps.-Seneca, *Octavia* 417–19; Virgil, *Aen.* 8.324–327).

way. In particular, the Greco-Roman tradition largely condemns the private hoarding of wealth, but where wealth is used for public beautification or public purposes, it is a welcome addition to utopia. Thus, regarding a bygone utopian era, Horace writes, “Their private wealth was small. Their public wealth was great. No portico laid out by ten-foot rod caught the dense northern shade for private citizens. The laws commanded them not to despise the turf beneath their feet, but to beautify at common cost their towns and the temples of their gods with freshly quarried stone” (*Carm.* 2.15.12–20 [West]). And similarly, Lucian, whose writings show a considerable interest in the condemnation of the abuse of wealth, constructs an afterlife scenario that is remarkably similar to that of Revelation’s, complete with gold, jewels, and expensive materials all of which are used on public property and for public enjoyment.⁶⁷ Publicly accessible wealth is indeed a good in the ancient Greco-Roman tradition, and, interestingly, this is exactly what one finds in the new Jerusalem. John describes the city and its streets as pure gold, the foundations of its walls adorned with jewels, and its gates as pearls. Every mention of wealth in the new Jerusalem is in the public sphere. To the Greco-Roman utopist, this would be perfectly acceptable.⁶⁸

4.3.3. Temple

John states very clearly that there is no temple in the city of the new Jerusalem (Rev 21:22). That there is no temple is odd for the Jewish-minded auditor, the GR-minded auditor, and perhaps even for John himself whose οὐκ εἶδον (“I did not see”) suggests that he indeed expected to see a temple

⁶⁷ *Ver. hist.* 2.5–29. See footnote 28 above for the comparison between Revelation and Lucian’s *True Story*.

⁶⁸ It is worth noting that one of the hallmarks of early Christianity was having all things in common, an idea found in Acts 2 and 4. Also, Lucian makes mention of Christian sharing in the *Passing of Peregrinus* 13. Furthermore, Josephus and Philo both describe the Essenes in communistic terms as sharing possessions (Josephus, *Ant.* 18.20; *J.W.* 2.122, 127; Philo, *Prob.* 76–78, 86, 91; *Hypoth.* 11.4; Pliny, *Nat.* 5.17.4). In light of this, it is not entirely out of bounds to suggest that John’s original audience, even his Jewish audience, could have heard echoes of communistic utopianism. For early Christian communism, see David L. Mealand, “Community of Goods and Utopian Allusions in Acts II–IV,” *JTS* (1977): 96–99; Hans-Josef Klauck, “Gütergemeinschaft in der klassischen Antike, in Qumran und in Neuen Testament,” *RevQ* 11 (1982): 47–79; Richard I. Pervo, “Panta Koina: The Feeding Stories in the Light of Economic Data and Social Practice,” in *Religious Propaganda and Missionary Competition in the New Testament World: Essays Honoring Dieter Georgi* (ed. L. Bormann, K. Del Tredici, A. Standhartinger; Novum Testamentum Supplements 74; Leiden: Brill, 1994), 163–94.

present in the new Jerusalem.⁶⁹ In both the Jewish and Greco-Roman traditions, temples are found in all expressions of utopia, and, other than Zeno, there are no traditions in either culture that clearly expect the absence of a temple in utopia.⁷⁰ Temples served to house the gods and would, therefore, be appropriate in a setting where one expected God to dwell, a feature of John's new Jerusalem.⁷¹ Furthermore, earlier in Revelation one reads that God is presently seated in a heavenly temple (11:19), and temple imagery is used throughout the book (e.g. the altar, cherubim, and lamp-stands are all images that conjure up the Jerusalem temple) making it all the more odd that the new Jerusalem is without a temple.⁷²

That God would reside in a temple in heaven but not in the new Jerusalem should cause one to ask, "why," a question John answers, though somewhat cryptically. John's reasoning in 21:22 (γὰρ) for the temple's absence is that the new Jerusalem's "temple is the Lord God the Almighty and the Lamb" (Rev 21:22). This is odd for those hearing within the Jewish tradition because the intimate presence of God in the eschaton has not stopped other Jewish authors from placing a temple in the eschaton (e.g. Isa 60:13; 66:6; Ezek 40–48; *Jub.* 1.27–29; 1 *En.* 90.28–29; 2 *Bar.* 4.1–6; *Sib. Or.* 3:702–709; 5:414–433).⁷³ In fact, one might suggest that the presence of God would serve quite an opposite purpose as John's Revelation suggest: it would *necessitate* the presence of a temple in the new Jerusalem in order to provide a space for God to dwell.⁷⁴ John, however, does not use temple imagery in 21:22 as God's home (though he does in 11:19). Here

⁶⁹ This last suggestion is Aune's (*Revelation* 17–22, 1166).

⁷⁰ The one exception noted in the Greco-Roman chapter is Zeno who forbids the building of temples in his Republic (Diogenes Laertius, 7.33; Plutarch, *Stoic rep.* 1034b). Aune recognizes that "while the notion of a heavenly or an eschatological Jerusalem was widespread in early Judaism . . . John is unique in claiming that there will be no temple within it" (Aune, *Revelation* 17–22, 1167–68).

⁷¹ For more on God's dwelling in the new Jerusalem, see below under *topos* "Divine Presence."

⁷² George Wesley Buchanan, *The Book of Revelation* (Lewiston, NY: Edwin Mellen, 1993), 595–96.

⁷³ Witherington also recognizes that the absence of a temple in the new Jerusalem "contrasts strongly with OT and early Jewish expectations about the eschatological Jerusalem" (*Revelation*, 271).

⁷⁴ Briggs argues (or perhaps asserts) that it is "apparent that any and all sorts of temples are but tokens of the old order in which special geographical points of contact between the Holy God and fallen humanity had to be established. . . . All agents of mediation will then not only be completely unnecessary, but in fact counterproductive and even profane" (*Jewish Temple Imagery*, 104). What Briggs here recognizes is that the Christ-event changed eschatological expectations. This almost certainly includes expectations regarding the temple.

the temple is not a space where God lives. The temple *is* God and God *is* the temple. Furthermore, it is not only God who is the temple but also the Lamb. The christological significance of the lamb is self-evident and might point to the fact that John's expectation of temple-less eschaton relies neither on Jewish nor Greco-Roman tradition but on a newly-minted, Christian tradition.⁷⁵

As early as Paul's letters to the Corinthians, we find evidence that Christians were re-envisioning the significance of the temple.⁷⁶ Paul recasts the temple in terms of the Christian community (1 Cor 3:16; 2 Cor 5:1–2; 6:16). The community as temple is something of an anomaly in ancient Jewish literature only found elsewhere in the writings from Qumran (e.g. 1QS IX, 3–6).⁷⁷ Moving from Paul to the gospels, temple imagery shifts from an ecclesiological setting (community as temple) to a christological setting (Jesus as temple), especially in John's gospel.⁷⁸ In all four gospels, Jesus both foretells the destruction of the temple (e.g. Mark 13:2 and parallels), and he "cleanses" it (Mark 11:15–19 and parallels). The gospel of John is unique, however, in that it combines the foretelling of the temple's destruction and the "cleansing" of the temple into one event (John 2:13–22). The fourth evangelist also moves this event from the gospel's end to the very front of his gospel suggesting a heightened importance. John's high Christology is on display when Jesus claims that the temple will be rebuilt in three days, and John clarifies that this is a reference to the "temple of his body" (John 2:21) effectively casting Jesus as the replacement of the temple itself.⁷⁹ When the author of Revelation, therefore, explains that there

⁷⁵ Aune asks whether the absence of the temple is part of an "anti-temple" or "anti-priestly" tradition, but neither is necessary (*Revelation 17–22*, 1166). The language of anti-temple is too strong here, particularly in light of John's use of temple language and imagery throughout Revelation.

⁷⁶ For a helpful survey of the temple in the New Testament, see Andrea Spatafora, *From the "Temple of God" to God as the Temple: A Biblical Theological Study of the Temple in the Book of Revelation* (Tesi Gregoriana Serie Teologia 27; Rome: Gregorian University Press, 1997), 87–125.

⁷⁷ Aune, *Revelation 17–22*, 1167; Heinz-Wolfgang Kuhn, "The Impact of Selected Qumran Texts on the Understanding of Pauline Theology," in *The Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. J. Charlesworth; The Second Princeton Symposium on Judaism and Christian Origins; vol. 3 of *The Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls*; Waco: Baylor Press, 2006), 162.

⁷⁸ Spatafora writes, "All the writers of the NT spiritualize the concept of temple and of sacrifice. The Gospel writers identify the temple with the person of Jesus. This is most explicit in the Fourth Gospel (cf. John 2,21). Paul instead identifies the temple with Church—the universal Church and the particular Church. He also calls the individual Christian's body the temple of the Holy Spirit" (*From the "Temple of God,"* 124).

⁷⁹ For more on Jesus as temple in John, see Mary Coloe, *God Dwells with Us: Temple Symbolism in the Fourth Gospel* (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 2001), 84.

is no temple in the new Jerusalem “because the temple is the Lord God the Almighty and the Lamb” (Rev 21:22), it is quite possible that he has a similar tradition in view.⁸⁰ Perhaps the author of Revelation is drawing on the same tradition that led the author of the fourth gospel to equate Jesus with the temple. Nevertheless, this is certainly not Jewish tradition. The most reasonable explanation is that John is drawing on a Christian tradition to explain the temple’s absence.

To add to the complexity, many scholars have suggested that John has described the city in such a way that it should be understood as a temple-city.⁸¹ On one level this claim seems out of place because, as discussed above, the author clearly states that the temple is God and the lamb; he never states that the temple is the city itself.⁸² Nevertheless, John’s Revelation is layered with meaning,⁸³ and there are indeed several clues indicating that the new Jerusalem should be understood as temple. First, its cubed shape has led many commentators to suggest a parallel with the holy of holies.⁸⁴ Second, Rowland notes the parallelism between Rev 7:15 and 22:3; both verses contain the worship of God, but only the

⁸⁰ Cf. Spatafora, *From the “Temple of God,”* 237–40; Prigent, *Commentary on the Apocalypse*, 621–22; Witherington, *Revelation*, 271.

⁸¹ See Christopher Rowland, *Revelation* (Epworth Commentaries; London: Epworth Press, 1993), 155–57; Beale, *Book of Revelation*, 1109–11; idem, *The Temple and the Church’s Mission: A Biblical Theology of the Dwelling Place of God* (NTBT; Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity Press, 2004), esp. 23–27, 328–34; Simon J. Kistemaker, “The Temple in the Apocalypse,” *JETS* 43 (2000): 440; Fekkes, *Isaiah and Prophetic Tradition*, 98–101.

⁸² Spatafora argues this line of reasoning against reading the city as the temple (*From the “Temple of God,”* 239–40).

⁸³ The layers include, but are not limited to: city as temple, city as paradise, city as bride, city as church.

⁸⁴ Cf. 1 Kgs 6:20; 2 Chron 3:8–13. The majority of commentators link the cube shape of the new Jerusalem with the holy of holies, the following is just a sampling: Blount, *Revelation*, 389; Bruce J. Malina and John J. Pilch, *Social-Science Commentary on the Book of Revelation* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2000), 250–51; Robert H. Mounce, *The Book of Revelation* (NICNT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1977), 380; Smalley, *Revelation*, 552; Charles H. Talbert, *The Apocalypse: A Reading of the Revelation of John* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1994), 101. It is odd that John would mention the “height” of the city of the new Jerusalem (a point little commented on in the commentaries). One would not ask, for example, What is the height of New York City? It is entirely unclear what John intends for this number to measure, the tallest building? The unusual mention of the city’s height (which is simply stated in passing as equal to its length and width) must, therefore, be symbolic. The point is not to place a number on how high the city is but to say that it is a cube. That its cubic shape is important to the author would quite naturally point the reader to the cubic shape of the holy of holies—*contra* Lupieri who argues that the “height” is actually the elevation of the city, which sits atop a very high mountain (*A Commentary on the Apocalypse*, 341–42). He objects to the absurdity of a cubic city; why he does not object to the idea of a mountain that that is 1400–1500 miles high is unclear.

first places the worship of God within the temple.⁸⁵ Third, Revelation contains two accounts of angels with measuring rods: Rev 11:1 and 21:15. In 11:1, the angel is asked to measure the temple, an act that parallels Ezekiel 40–48. In 21:15, the angel, this time using a golden measuring rod, measures the city of the new Jerusalem. That the angel would measure the city likely harkens back to the measurement of the temple in chapter 11 and the motif of measuring the temple in Jewish tradition.⁸⁶ Fourth, Vanhoye⁸⁷ and others⁸⁸ have made a strong case that the entirety of the book of Revelation proceeds in roughly the same order as that of Ezekiel concluding with John's new Jerusalem as a parallel to Ezekiel 40–48 in which the eschatological temple is described at length. Finally, that God and the Lamb find their home in the midst of the city of the new Jerusalem further suggest that this space is intended to act as the new temple. The difference, of course, is that in this new heaven and new earth, the walls that separate God from his people will be abolished. There is no structure, whether physical (the temple itself) or cultic, necessary for keeping God at bay so as to maintain the purity of the holy one. In the new Jerusalem, all is pure, and all is temple.

4.3.4. *Rivers/Water*

Two important references to water can be found in Revelation 21–22. First, in Rev 21:1, John makes the unique claim that the new heavens and the new earth will not contain a sea. In this reconstructed cosmos, “the sea is no more.” Second, John twice mentions “water of life,” first noting the spring (τῆς πηγῆς) of the water of life in 21:6 and then the river (ποταμόν) of the water of life in 22:1.

⁸⁵ Rowland, *Revelation*, 155.

⁸⁶ Smalley, *Revelation*, 550–51.

⁸⁷ Albert Vanhoye, “L'utilisation du livre d'Ezéchiel dans l'Apocalypse,” *Bib* 43 (1962): 436–77.

⁸⁸ Michael D. Goulder, “The Apocalypse as an Annual Cycle of Prophecies,” *NTS* 27 (1981): 342–67; Vogelgesang, “The Interpretation of Ezekiel in the Book of Revelation,” 9–10. Mathewson (*A New Heaven and a New Earth*, 29) distills their research into the following chart:

Ezek. 1	Rev. 1
Ezek. 2	Rev. 5 (10)
Ezek. 9–10	Rev. 7–8
Ezek. 16, 23	Rev. 17
Ezek. 26–28	Rev. 18
Ezek. 38–39	Rev. 19–20
Ezek. 40–48	Rev. 21–22 (11)

4.3.4.1. *The Sea is No More*

In Rev 21:1, John states that with the dawn of the new heaven and the new earth, the sea is no more.⁸⁹ The notion that the eschaton will not have a sea does not have any direct parallels in either a Jewish or Greco-Roman tradition. Scholars have noted a number of scriptural passages that refer to the drying up of the sea (e.g. Joel 1:20; Amos 7:4; Nah 1:4; Hab 3:8–15),⁹⁰ but as Moo notes, these resonances differ significantly from Rev 21:1 in that the drying up of water in the Hebrew Scriptures is an act of judgment whereas Rev 21:1 casts the removal of the sea in terms of blessing.⁹¹ Moo writes: “The end of the sea cannot be construed as a further punishment of humankind or even of evil nations, but rather its absence is an integral part of what makes the new creation a place of joy, without evil, death, pain or sorrow.”⁹² The removal of the sea, as Moo has here indicated, is linked with the content of what follows in Rev 21:2–5, especially v. 4 and the removal of death, mourning, crying and pain.⁹³

Reading the passage through a Jewish lens opens up two legitimate renderings of this passage: 1. the removal of sea enables new exodus to happen; 2. the removal of the sea is representative of the annihilation of all death and evil from the world to come. Mathewson has convincingly argued that the removal of the sea should be read as a reference to a new

⁸⁹ For secondary literature on this unique saying, see Jonathan Moo, “The Sea that is No More: Rev 21:1 and the Function of Sea Imagery in the Apocalypse of John,” *NovT* 51 (2009): 148–167; David Mathewson, “New Exodus as a Background for ‘The Sea Was No More’ in Revelation 21:1C,” *TJ* 24 (2003): 243–58; Thomas E. Schmidt, “‘And the Sea Was No More’: Water as People, Not Place,” in *To Tell the Mystery: Essays on New Testament Eschatology in Honor of Robert H. Gundry* (eds. T. Schmidt and M. Silva; JSNTSup 100; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994), 233–49.

⁹⁰ Moo, “The Sea that is No More,” 161–62. Other possible parallels mentioned by Moo include *Sib. Or.* 5:155–160, 447–448; *As. Mos.* 10:6; *T. Levi* 4:1.

⁹¹ Commentators also point to other apocalyptic texts that reference the demise of the sea; e.g. *T. Mos.* 10:6; *Sib. Or.* 5:158–59, 447; *T. Levi* 4:1 (cf. Mounce, *Book of Revelation*, 370; Talbert, *Apocalypse*, 99). All of these texts, however, reference an eschatological punishment and an ominous sign of the eschaton. While such ideas are, perhaps, in the purview of the reader, chapter 21 shifts the attention away from matters of punishment toward matters of a redeemed world making other readings more likely.

⁹² Moo, “The Sea that is No More,” 162.

⁹³ Many scholars have recognized the chiasmic nature of Rev 21:1–5a which links together the removal of the sea and the removal of death etc. (see Jacques van Ruiten, “The Intertextual Relationship between Isaiah 65, 17–20 and Revelation 21, 1–5b,” *EstBib* 51 [1993]: 475–77; Aune, *Revelation* 17–22, 113–14; Fekkes, *Isaiah and Prophetic Tradition*, 258; Mathewson, *A New Heaven and a New Earth*, 33). As one who is wary of the often subjective nature of chiasms, this is one of the more clear examples from the New Testament. For more Rev 21:4 and the removal of “mourning, crying, and pain,” see the *topoi* “Citizens: Reduced anxiety” and “Work.”

exodus, particularly through an appeal to passages that utilize the crossing of the Red Sea from the exodus narrative.⁹⁴ Thus Isa 51:8–11:

But my deliverance will be forever, and my salvation to all generations. Awake, awake, put on strength, O arm of the LORD! Awake, as in days of old, the generations of long ago! . . . Was it not you who *dried up the sea*, the waters of the great deep; who made the depths of the sea a way for the redeemed to cross over? So the ransomed of the LORD shall return, and come to Zion with singing; everlasting joy shall be upon their heads; they shall obtain joy and gladness, and sorrow and sighing shall flee away.⁹⁵

The drying up of the sea, then, produces an easy passage back to Jerusalem, a notion that comports well with other passages in Revelation that invite the nations, all tribes and languages from every corner of the earth, to flock to the new Jerusalem (11:9; 21:24–27). As Mathewson notes: “By conceiving of the sea of Rev. 21.1c within the new exodus-exilic return framework as the Red Sea of hostility and affliction, the sea no longer constitutes a barrier to entrance into the new heavens and earth and new Jerusalem, but has been removed with their establishment.”⁹⁶ That the “sea is no more” in the eschaton signals the Jewish-minded reader that within the cosmology of the new heavens and new earth nothing stands in the way between God, who dwells in the new Jerusalem, and his people who are exiled—in one form or another—throughout the world.

The metaphor of the sea, however, would likely have resonated with a Jewish-minded reader in at least one other way, i.e. as the abode of the dead and of all things evil.⁹⁷ In Rev 13:1 John describes the great dragon as standing on the seashore awaiting the beast who arises out of the sea. Further, in Rev 20:13—just three verses prior to the removal of the sea in 21:1—John mentions the sea as the abode of the dead and in conjunction with Death and Hades, both of whom are thrown into the lake of fire. And because the sea is not thrown into the lake of fire, it too must be dealt with. John does this, of course, by reordering the cosmos to exclude

⁹⁴ Mathewson, “New Exodus as Background”; cf. idem, *A New Heaven and a New Earth*, 64–69; Beale, *Book of Revelation*, 1050–51.

⁹⁵ See also Isa 44:27; 50:2; Zech 10:10–12.

⁹⁶ Mathewson, *A New Heaven and a New Earth*, 68.

⁹⁷ That the sea is associated with death, evil and chaos has certainly not escaped the notice of the vast majority of commentators. See, e.g., Aune, *Revelation 17–22*, 119–20; Richard Bauckham, *The Theology of the Book of Revelation*, 53; Beale, *Book of Revelation*, 1042–43, 1050–51; Stephen S. Smalley, *The Revelation to John: A Commentary on the Greek Text of the Apocalypse* (Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity Press, 2005), 524–25; Talbert, *Apocalypse*, 99.

a place for the dead because, as he writes just verses later, “Death will be no more” (21:4). The new heaven and the new earth is a place characterized by life—thus the river of life, the tree of life, and the lamb’s book of life—and will be a place where all manner of evil has no space to dwell because its home has been abolished. The cosmological significance of this statement is worth noting. John conceives of the present universe as a three-tiered cosmos in which God primarily occupies the heavens (though others are present too), humans occupy the earth, and the dead and evil beings occupy the sea and the underworld.⁹⁸ Unlike the more traditional three-tiered cosmology that does not allow for much movement between the tiers (e.g. the dead do not typically go back to the earth nor do those on the earth typically go to heaven, though God is capable of entering all tiers), John’s three-tiered cosmos allows for more crossover.⁹⁹ Nevertheless, in the eschaton, John envisions a collapsed world in which heaven and earth are fused with God dwelling among humans (Rev 21:3), and the sea, Hades, and the underworld have been removed altogether. The result, in essence, is a one-tiered world where the human and divine are no longer alienated from one another, and the tier of the abode of the dead has been removed entirely.

The GR-minded reader, through a close reading of Revelation, would likely hear that Hades and Death had been destroyed and were no longer present in the new cosmos (along with the Jewish-minded reader). The sea as the abode of the dead may not have been a prevalent idea in Greco-Roman literature,¹⁰⁰ but the divine figures of Hades (ὁ Ἀΐδης) and Death (ὁ Θάνατος) certainly were (cf. Rev 20:13–14).¹⁰¹ That these two figures are lumped together with “the sea” and are thrown into the lake of fire and destroyed forever would have been significant to the GR-minded auditor. Their disappearance would signal that John has conceived of a completely

⁹⁸ For a recent study on the cosmology of Revelation, see Sean Michael Ryan, *Hearing at the Boundaries of Vision: Education Informing Cosmology in Revelation 9* (LNTS 448; New York: T&T Clark, 2012); cf. Paul S. Minear, “The Cosmology of the Apocalypse,” in *Current Issues in the New Testament Interpretation: Essays in Honor of O. A. Piper* (ed. W. Klassen and G. F. Snyder; New York: Harper and Row, 1962), 23–37.

⁹⁹ For further discussion of the three-tiered cosmos as it appears in ancient Israelite tradition, see J. Edward Wright, *The Early History of Heaven*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), 52–54.

¹⁰⁰ Thus the sea was ruled by Poseidon, and the underworld, the place of the dead, was ruled by Hades.

¹⁰¹ Hades was a name for both the god of the underworld (and brother of Zeus) and the underworld itself. Thanatos was a lesser-known daemon who appears in Hesiod’s *Theogony* (211–212) and Homer’s *Iliad* (16.671–675) and plays a minor role in Greek mythology.

reordered universe. There are enough clues within the book of Revelation itself that, for the uninitiated, the sea as a place for the dead, evil and chaos would not have been a stretch to hear.

On the other hand, for those GR-minded auditors whose ears were not ready to hear “second exodus” metaphors, one can easily imagine that any notion of a return from exile would have been lost. However, an interesting parallel would have replaced it. In chapter two it was argued that the oceans serve an important purpose with regard to utopia. They keep people out. Utopian paradises, whether afterlife or primitivistic, were always beyond reach and typically cordoned off by the ocean. The Islands of the Blessed were in the far west, the Ethiopians in the far south, and the Hyperboreans in the far north.¹⁰² Also, Iambulus’ Island of the Sun (Diodorus Siculus, 2.54–60) and Euhemerus’ Island of Panchea (Diodorus Siculus, 5.42.1–46.7; 6.1.4–10), both of which served as idyllic, utopian locales, are (mostly) impossible to reach due to their watery walls.

Along with the sea as a means of keeping people out of utopia, so also was sea travel viewed negatively, especially by primitivists.¹⁰³ Strabo, for example, notes that seafaring leads to a “morally worse” society due to the interaction and comingling with other societies (*Geog.* 7.3.7). The need to keep one’s society pure from other nefarious influences is also near the heart of why utopia is typically located beyond an oceanic boundary. Utopian societies remain utopian only insofar as they are not “infected” by the degenerate nature of the world, including (and often most egregiously) the societies within which the Greco-Roman authors were writing.¹⁰⁴

In essence, the location of the Greco-Roman utopia as situated beyond the sea functions to provide a space for a world that is better, purer, and happier than this present world, an idyllic world of which this present world can only dream. And in an age where satellites are not able to map out every square inch of the world, and “Google earth” does not exist, there is still the possibility that an island exists in the middle of the Atlantic with a utopian reality that defies all logic. An island where food grows of its own accord, the climate is mild all year round, peace abounds, and

¹⁰² Rhiannon Evans, *Utopia Antiqua*, makes this point explicit (*Utopia Antiqua*, 14–18).

¹⁰³ See Aratus, *Phaen.* 110–11; Lucretius, *de Rerum Natura* 5.999–1006; Seneca, *Nat.* 5.18.12; Ovid, *Met.* 1.94–96; Tibullus, *Elegies* 1.3.37–47.

¹⁰⁴ Rhiannon Evans, *Utopia Antiqua: Readings of the Golden Age and Decline at Rome* (London: Routledge, 2008), 14. For the importance of “natural” living, see Arthur O. Lovejoy and George Boas, *Primitivism and Related Ideas in Antiquity* (vol. 1 of *A Documentary History of Primitivism and Related Ideas*; ed. A. O. Lovejoy, G. Chinard, G. Boas, and R. S. Crane; Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1935), 14–15.

rivers of wine, milk, and honey actually exist. In the Greco-Roman tradition, then, the sea serves to protect utopia and to give space for the imagination.

In light of this understanding of the sea with respect to utopia, the GR-minded reader would hear Rev 21:1 in a way that can be differentiated from the Jewish-minded reader, even if the idea that is heard is conceptually parallel. For the Jewish-minded reader, the removal of the seas allows for return from exile—exile defined by the larger biblical narrative and Jewish traditions within which the Jewish-minded reader stands. The GR-minded reader too recognizes that he or she is in exile of sorts—kept from experiencing utopia and forced to live in a world where all is not right.¹⁰⁵ With the dawn of a cosmos without an ocean, there is now no longer anything standing in the way of accessing utopia. The utopia that was once characterized by its inaccessibility is now characterized by its accessibility, a point underscored by John's statement that the nations and their kings will flock to it, and its gates will never be closed (Rev 21:24–25). The inclusive nature of the new Jerusalem is striking, and the eternal city is characterized by what Brian Blount calls a "radical openness."¹⁰⁶ Furthermore, that evil and the corruptive forces of society have been removed altogether (thrown into the lake of fire in Revelation 20 and excluded in Rev 21:8) is a necessary part of a world without seas, because the ocean once served a purpose in keeping utopia "pure." But after the great judgment, all that is left is pure. The new cosmos described by John has no home for evil. In this way, the removal of the sea highlights, for the GR-minded auditor, the accessibility of utopia and the purity of the new cosmos.

In conclusion, John's phrase "the sea is no more" would have evoked slightly different responses from the Jewish-minded auditor and the GR-minded auditor. The former would have heard John speaking about a "new exodus" and a new cosmology without death and evil. The latter would have heard the new cosmology but not "new exodus." Instead, the GR-auditor likely would have conjured up notions about the accessibility of utopia and the purity of the new cosmos.

¹⁰⁵ This lies at the heart of chronological primitivism—the world *once* was right, but we live in an age where all is not well. The desire to return to the golden age captivated the Roman imagination.

¹⁰⁶ Blount, *Revelation*, 394.

4.3.4.2. *The Water of Life*

John uses the phrase “water of life” (ὕδωρ ζωῆς) four times in his Revelation (7:17; 21:6; 22:1, 17).¹⁰⁷ In each of these instances, the water is tied to the eschaton in some way, and partaking of this water has salvific effects leading to life eternal.¹⁰⁸ Furthermore, the river of the water of life is said to run from God’s throne through the middle of the street (22:1). On each of its sides are trees filled with fruit in all seasons. The leaves of the fruit are for the healing of the nations.

The image of a river running through Jerusalem, giving life, and producing an abundance of food is one that, for the Jewish-minded auditor, would have resonated strongly with other Jewish texts that give similar descriptions of the eschaton. Both Joel and Zechariah describe an eschatological Jerusalem with a river running through it (Joel 3:18; Zech 14:8). Zechariah even uses the phrase “living waters” to describe the river that flows from Jerusalem. Yet of the available parallels, the utopian description of the eschaton in Ezekiel 47 comes closest to what we find in Rev 22:1–2. John’s new Jerusalem contains at least five details that parallel Ezekiel’s vision.¹⁰⁹ First, Ezekiel describes the eschatological Jerusalem as having a river flowing from underneath the temple toward the east. Since John’s new Jerusalem does not have a temple, the river flows “from the throne of God and of the Lamb” (Rev 22:1). Second, Ezekiel takes time to describe the depth of the river, the direction the river flows, but most importantly for Revelation, he states that “everything will live where the river goes” (Ezek 47:9). It is a life-giving river just as Revelation’s river is a “river of life.” Third, on the banks of Ezekiel’s river grow “all kinds of trees” (Ezek 47:12). Revelation slightly adapts this and notes that its trees grow “twelve kinds of fruit” (22:2). Fourth, Ezekiel’s trees “bear fresh fruit every month” while Revelation’s tree do the exact same (Rev 22:2). Finally, Ezekiel notes that while the fruit of the tree is for food, “their leaves [are] for healing.” This last phrase undoubtedly stands behind John’s similar statement that the leaves of the tree in the new Jerusalem are also “for

¹⁰⁷ Revelation 7:17 is an odd construction in which the author places the noun being modified (*springs*) in between life and waters (only here is it plural): ζωῆς πηγὰς ὑδάτων.

¹⁰⁸ This view is common among the commentaries: Mounce, *Book of Revelation*, 374; Edmondo F. Lupieri, *A Commentary on the Apocalypse of John* (tr. M. Johnson and A. Kamesar; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006); trans. of *L’Apocalisse di Giovanni* (Milan: Fondazione Lorenzo Valla, 1999), 362.

¹⁰⁹ For a similar comparison, see Vogelgesang, “The Interpretation of Ezekiel in the Book of Revelation,” 108–112.

healing,” though John adds the qualifier “for the nations.”¹¹⁰ To be sure, John’s Jewish-minded audience would have heard the vision of the new Jerusalem as one standing in a strong, prophetic, eschatological tradition, whether that of Joel, Zechariah, or most likely Ezekiel.

The GR-minded auditor would not necessarily need the Jewish traditions to inform him or her of the salvific significance of the “living waters,” a phrase used frequently enough in Revelation to give context to the phrase. Nevertheless, the GR-minded auditor would not be aware of Ezekiel, Zechariah, or Joel, and therefore might be more surprised by a river running through the city than would his Jewish-minded counterpart. For this reader, a river flowing in Jerusalem (a city without rivers) might sound fanciful and add to the mystique of the new Jerusalem, whereas this river is to be expected for the Jewish-minded auditor.

Drawing from a cache of traditions about rivers in utopia, it is quite possible that the GR-minded auditor would hear a few subtle differences in the phrase “waters of life.” One function of rivers in Greco-Roman utopian settings is that they often are thought to have healing properties. For example, on Iambulus’ utopian island are “abundant springs of water, the warm springs serving well for bathing and the relief of fatigue, the cold excelling in sweetness and possessing the power to contribute to good health” (Diodorus, 2.57.3). There are also warm springs said to be “sweet and health-giving” (2.59.9; cf. 5.19.3; 5.44.3). Horace similarly describes a spring on his own farm with utopian language, stating that the spring “flows with healing for sickly heads and sickly stomachs” and helps keep him in “sound health in September’s heat” (*Ep.* 1.16.14, 16). In light of these parallels, and in the context of a passage that includes healing leaves (Rev 22:2), it is possible Revelation’s “water of life” would have been heard as regenerative waters capable of curing bodily ailments.

Another way a GR-minded auditor might have understood the new Jerusalem’s river, which runs through the streets of Jerusalem, is as a means of beautifying the utopia.¹¹¹ Homer’s description of Alcinous’ house includes

¹¹⁰ That John includes this is no small addition since Ezekiel’s eschaton was characteristically exclusivistic toward the nations (cf. Kathryn Pfisterer Darr, “The Wall around Paradise: Ezekielian Ideas about the Future,” *VT* 37 [1987]: 271–79). For more on the inclusivism of John’s new Jerusalem, see below under *topos* “Citizens: Inclusivism/Exclusivism.”

¹¹¹ In Menander’s rhetorical treatise on how to praise a city, he mentions that one should consider the water-supply which include three possibilities: springs, rivers, and lakes (πηγῶν; ποταμῶν; λιμνῶν; 1.349). He notes that these are to be judged on both pleasure and usefulness. If Menander’s rhetoric can be traced back to the first century, then it is quite possible that John’s Greco-Roman readers would expect the river (22:2) and the spring (Rev 21:6) of the new Jerusalem to be pleasurable.

two springs of water that flow through the gardens, on the one hand, and beneath the court on the other hand. Homer describes the beauty of the house as a “glorious gift of the gods” (*Od.* 7.127–132). Plato’s ideal city includes the use of rivers to beautify the city directing streams “right into the temples of the gods” (*Laws* 761C). That Revelation’s river flows out of the throne of God, who is the embodiment of the temple, could easily have been heard through a Platonic lens about how to construct a beautiful, utopian city.

The result, therefore, is that while the GR-minded auditor would have likely heard the river of the water of life as a means of eternal life (given John’s language elsewhere in Revelation; 7:17; 22:17), he or she might have envisioned this same river, which flows from the throne through the streets of Jerusalem, as a way of beautifying the eschatological utopia and perhaps even as a means of physical healing.

4.3.5. *Wine*

Wine, vines, vineyards, and grapes do not make an appearance in the final two chapters of Revelation. Wine is not said to be in abundance in the new Jerusalem, an expectation that both Jewish-minded and GR-minded persons might have. And though wine imagery appears elsewhere in the Apocalypse, it is typically with respect to judgment and not utopian bliss. Thus, in Rev 14:10 one finds the “wine of God’s wrath,” and in 16:19, “God remembered great Babylon and gave her the wine-cup of the fury of his wrath.”¹¹² The topos of wine, whether in the form of rivers of wine (e.g. Amos 9:13; Lucian, *Ver. hist.*, 2.18) or an abundance of grapes (e.g. 1 *En.* 10:19; 2 *Bar.* 29.5), is not employed by the author to portray Revelation’s utopia.

4.3.6. *Food*

Food and imagery related to eating is found throughout the book of Revelation.¹¹³ In the last two chapters, food makes an appearance in the

¹¹² Other wine/grape imagery appears in Rev 6:6; 14:8, 10, 18, 19, 20; 16:19; 17:2; 18:3, 13; 19:15.

¹¹³ Lichtenberger’s study on the food of the Apocalypse bears this out (Hermann Lichtenberger, “Die Mahlmetaphorik in der Johannesapokalypse,” in *Le Repas de Dieu / Das Mahl Gottes* [WUNT 169; ed. C. Grappe; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004], 227–52). Outside of our passage, see, e.g., Rev 2:7, 14, 20; 3:20; 7:16–17; 10:9–10; 14:14–20; 17:16; 19:7–9, 17–18, 21; 22:14, 19. Many of these are far from utopian and are even downright gruesome (e.g. eating human flesh!).

form of the fruit of the tree of life:¹¹⁴ “On either side of the river is the tree of life with its twelve kinds of fruit, producing its fruit each month” (Rev 22:2). By stating that the tree in the new Jerusalem is the “tree of life” (ξύλον ζωῆς), a link is created between the eschatological utopia of the new Jerusalem and the Edenic utopia.¹¹⁵ However, matters are often not so simple with the book of Revelation. The tree (singular ξύλον) mentioned in Revelation 22 stands on “each side” (ἐντεῦθεν καὶ ἐκεῖθεν) of the river of life that flows through the center of town, perhaps suggesting that the tree is not one tree but many trees.¹¹⁶ Also, that this tree produces “twelve kinds of fruit” is odd given that “normal” trees only produce one kind of fruit. And finally, that the tree produces fruit each month is also odd since plants and trees are typically governed by seasons. At this point it should be obvious: this is no ordinary tree, but then again, the new Jerusalem is no ordinary place.

Before addressing the nature of the tree’s fruit and food in the eschatological utopia, a word needs to be said about the translational difficulties posed by Rev 22:1–2. The text is notoriously difficult to understand for a few reasons, the first of which regards punctuation. The question is whether the phrase ἐν μέσῳ τῆς πλατείας (22:2) should go with what precedes or what follows it. In other words, is it the river that flows down “the middle of the street,” or does the tree of life grow “between the street” and

¹¹⁴ Smit also treats the “water of life” in Rev 21:6 as a foodstuff, but this study treats that passage under the *topos* “Rivers/Water” (Peter-Ben Smit, *Fellowship and Food in the Kingdom: Eschatological Meals and Scenes of Utopian Abundance in the New Testament* [WUNT 2, 234; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008], 364–65).

¹¹⁵ It should be noted that Revelation elsewhere mentions the tree of life (Rev 2:7; 22:14, 19). Revelation 2:7 explicitly states that the tree of life is in “the paradise of God,” and all who “conquer” are granted access to it. The paradise of God, of course, is a reference to Eden.

¹¹⁶ Most scholars opt for this position stating that ξύλον (“tree”) is a collective use of the singular (thus, “trees”); see Wilhelm Bousset, *Die Offenbarung Johannes* (KEK 16; 6th ed.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1906), 452; R. H. Charles, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Revelation of St. John* (2 vols.; ICC; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1920), 2:176; Ibson T. Beckwith, *The Apocalypse of John* (New York: Macmillan, 1919), 765; Austin Farrer, *The Revelation of St. John the Divine* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1964), 222; Aune, *Revelation* 17–22, 1177; Beale, *Book of Revelation*, 1106. Resseguie, however, takes issue with a collective rendering and suggests “that would destroy John’s imagery” (Resseguie, *Revelation Unsealed*, 90, n. 42). With Vogelgesang (“The Interpretation of Ezekiel in the Book of Revelation,” 108), however, this study argues that John is here combining two traditions that are not entirely compatible, i.e. the tradition of the trees on both sides of the river of Ezekiel 47 and the “tree of life” tradition that stems from Genesis 2–3 in which there is only one tree (see below for more).

the river, which presumably run side-by-side?¹¹⁷ NA²⁷ punctuates it as the latter,¹¹⁸ but many English translations opt for the former.¹¹⁹ The second problem has to do with whether one should take the singular ξύλον (tree) in a plural sense (see the following paragraph for more on this). However, one must ask whether a detailed sketch of exactly what John is here envisioning is necessary. It seems not. John is painting an impressionistic portrait with broad strokes using a large, perhaps unwieldy, brush. He is not concerned with the details of his portrait, but his interest are, as Mathewson notes, in the “meanings conveyed by the symbols.”¹²⁰ His symbols are drawn from two traditions: Ezekiel’s eschatological Jerusalem (Ezek 47:1–12) and the tree of life tradition that stems from Genesis 2–3.

It should first be noted that commentators widely accept Ezek 47:12 to be standing in the background of John’s description of the tree and its leaves in Rev 22:2.¹²¹ In Ezekiel we find the following: “On the banks, on both sides of the river, there will grow all kinds of trees (רע; LXX ξύλον) for food. Their leaves will not wither nor their fruit fail, but they will bear fresh fruit every month, because the water for them flows from the sanctuary. Their fruit will be for food, and their leaves for healing.” Though the term Ezekiel uses for “trees,” as found in both the MT (רע) and the LXX (ξύλον), is singular, the context clarifies that he indeed has in mind a plurality of trees—in particular, he notes that the trees are on the banks of both sides of the river (מזה ומזה; LXX ἐνθεν καὶ ἐνθεν) and that “all kinds” (כל; LXX πᾶν) of trees are growing. Though the river and tree

¹¹⁷ One other translational option is that the tree grows “in the middle of” the street. Cf. Mounce cites Caird, Walvoord and Lenski as interpreters who note this translation (*The Book of Revelation*, 387).

¹¹⁸ This is followed by the KJV, NKJV, NJB.

¹¹⁹ NRSV, RSV, ASV, NIV, NSB, ESV; Aune also prefers this option (*Revelation* 17–22, 1177). For further discussion of this issue, see É. Delebecque, “Où situer l’arbre de vie dans la Jérusalem céleste? Note sur Apocalypse 22, 2,” *RevThom* 88 (1988): 124–30. Most commentators are reticent to choose sides here, but instead simply offer the options and leave it at that (Beale, *Book of Revelation*; Mathewson, *A New Heaven and a New Earth*). Prigent poses the questions noted here and concludes: “These speculations are specious ones, We have yielded to them because all the commentators stop to consider this point at length, and because we find justification here for our translation (“avenue”). But one must hasten to add that the only matter that is important is the intention that is served by this text, namely to show that the awaited paradise is not the Eden of the outset, but the fulfillment of the history of salvation, and particularly of the prophecies which announce its outcome” (*Commentary of the Apocalypse*, 626). This study follows this position.

¹²⁰ Mathewson, *A New Heaven and a New Earth*, 191.

¹²¹ See Mathewson’s comparison of the texts of Rev 22:1–2 and Ezek 47:1–12 (*A New Heaven and a New Earth*, 188). Such a comparison of the two makes it nearly impossible to miss that John knew and used Ezekiel here.

evoke pastoral and Edenic imagery, it appears that Ezekiel is not relying on Genesis 2–3 as can be seen by a complete lack of reference to anything overtly Edenic in Ezekiel 47. This is interesting, from a historical standpoint, because the author clearly knows of Eden (Ezekiel 28; 31; 36:35), but his mention of Eden is devoid of any narrational aspects of Genesis 2–3. Instead, he speaks generically about trees of Eden and includes a strange tradition about their descent into Sheol (Ezek 31:9, 16, 18). Nevertheless, in Ezekiel 47, one does not even find this much. The author never labels the tree(s) the “tree of life,” nor does he label the river one of the four rivers mentioned in Genesis 2–3. There is no evidence that Ezekiel 47 alludes to Genesis 2–3.¹²²

Returning to Rev 22:2, John echoes much of the language that one finds in Ezekiel 47. As with Ezekiel, John’s primary focus is the river that flows from the place of God (for John, the throne; for Ezekiel, the temple). Like Ezekiel, John uses the singular “tree”; and for both authors the tree(s) are on both sides of the river. But John’s text has a problem that Ezekiel’s does not: John calls this tree the “tree of life” (ξύλον ζωῆς), an undeniable reference to the Genesis tree based on John’s statement in Rev 2:7 that those who conquer will eat of the “tree of life in the paradise of God.”

The problem John has created, of course, is that where Ezekiel’s singular noun “tree” can be easily read as having a plural sense to it, John’s singular noun must carry the weight of Ezekiel’s plurality (and the plurality of being on both sides of the bank) *and* the singularity of the tree of life tradition. There are no “trees of life” in Jewish and Christian tradition; there is only the “tree of life.” This problem has caused considerable conflict among commentators, some of whom opt for a singular tree in order to preserve the Edenic allusion and others who opt for multiple trees in order to make sense of the fact that a tree cannot be on both sides of a river.¹²³ Contra Beale, who suggests that perhaps John conceives of the tree of life having multiplied sprouting new trees of life, it is more likely that John has conflated Ezekiel 47 and Genesis 2–3 assuming that Ezekiel’s

¹²² In chapter three it is argued that it is quite possible the tree of life and the tree of knowledge are late additions to the biblical text given that neither is used anywhere in the Hebrew Scripture as they are used in Genesis 2–3, and they do not appear together in any extant text (outside of Genesis 2–3) until Josephus and Philo in the first century C.E. That Ezekiel (the only biblical author who knows of a Genesis-style Eden) knows of Eden but speaks of “trees of Eden” rather than the tree of life or tree of knowledge suggests the strong possibility that he is unaware of such trees.

¹²³ The commentaries mostly prefer the plural imagery of trees. See footnote 116 above for examples.

tree is the tree of life—based on the importance of the tree of life for John elsewhere in Revelation (2:7; 22:14, 19).¹²⁴ If one must choose, therefore, a single tree is preferable because John's primary influence is the tree of life and its traditions; he then fills his new Jerusalem scene using Ezekielian imagery and language, thus causing the conflict. How John's audience—specifically his Jewish-minded audience—would have responded to his description is hard to say, but given the strength of the tree of life tradition in early Judaism, it is quite likely that this tradition would not have been lost merely because John's scene contains what could be read as multiple trees.

It first must be noted that the tree of life shows up four times in the book of Revelation (2:7; 22:2, 14, 19). In the letter to Ephesus, John encourages the recipients to “conquer” by offering them access to the fruit of the tree of life, which he says is “in the paradise of God” (ἐν τῷ παραδείσῳ τοῦ θεοῦ), a term used only here in Revelation (Rev 2:7). That one finds the tree of life in the new Jerusalem, then, clearly indicates that this eschatological utopia is Eden reopened. In this way, John's description of the utopian Jerusalem, i.e. the paradise of God, forms an *inclusio* with the letters

¹²⁴ Beale, *The Book of Revelation*, 1106. This comports with what is likely a misunderstanding of 1 *Enoch* 24–25 as the tree of life by both modern scholarship and ancient interpreters. 1 *Enoch* 24–25 contains a tree that is described similarly to Ezekiel's that is transplanted in Jerusalem—most notably, the leaves and the blossom of the tree are said to “not wither” (24.4), likely an echo of the tree in Ezek 47:12, the leaves of which do not wither and the fruit does not fail. Interestingly, at 25.5 a mistranslation seeps into the tradition where the Greek and Ethiopic states that the fruit of this tree is given “for life” rather than “for the elect” as is found in the Aramaic original (see George W. E. Nickelsburg, 1 *Enoch* 1: *A Commentary on the Book of 1 Enoch, Chapters 1–36; 81–108* [Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2001], 313). Such a mistranslation leads to equating the tree of 1 *Enoch* 24–25 with the tree of life in Genesis. It is argued in chapter three, however, that it is unlikely the author/editor of 1 *Enoch* was aware of the tree of life tradition but did know the Ezekiel tradition and the tree of knowledge tradition (1 *Enoch* 32). What one finds in the mistranslation, then, is a conflation of Edenic and Ezekielian imagery in early Judaism, a conflation similar to what is found in Rev 22:2. Olson also notes the similarities between Rev 22:2 and 1 *Enoch* 24–25, though he argues that John is directly dependent upon both Ezekiel and 1 *Enoch* and that he has both documents “before him” (Daniel C. Olson, “Those Who Have Not Defiled Themselves with Women’: Revelation 14:4 and the Book of Enoch,” *CBQ* 59 (1997): 492–510 [esp. 498–500]). The two problems with Olson's work are (1) his assumption that the tree of 1 *Enoch* 24–25 is the tree of life, a point contested above, and, perhaps more problematic, (2) his analysis of five ways in which John alters Ezekiel's vision, five ways that he claims parallels 1 *Enoch* (p. 499). His claim that all five alterations are present in John is not convincing (e.g. “the food is reserved for the elect”); even that the five alterations are present in 1 *Enoch* 24–25 is not without question. Nevertheless, the parallel between 1 *Enoch* 24–25 and Revelation 22 is worth exploring, just not in the way Olson has done so.

in Revelation 1–3 providing a visual fulfillment of the promises offered in the opening chapters.¹²⁵

For John's Jewish-minded audience, mentioning the tree of life raises a host of traditions about Eden.¹²⁶ While Genesis 2–3 might be the first place to turn to look for echoes, that Eden is here an eschatological paradise suggests that other Edenic traditions that fuse the *Urzeit* and *Endzeit* would likely be heard as well.¹²⁷ As mentioned in chapter three, the tree of life is most typically found in future-oriented settings (as opposed to the tree of knowledge, which is more often rear-facing—an idea that is borne out in Revelation since it does not mention the tree of knowledge and is ultimately not concerned with the primeval Eden).¹²⁸ In Gen 3:22, God is concerned that the “fallen” Adam and Eve might eat from the tree of life and “live forever.” For this reason, God exiles them from the garden. Jewish tradition takes up this theme and suggests that indeed the garden of Eden still contains the tree of life (though sometimes transplanted to a heavenly Eden), and at the eschaton, the tree will once again be revealed and the garden opened giving all the citizens of the eschaton the ability

¹²⁵ As most commentators recognize, this is true not only of the letter to the Ephesians. The Smyrnans are offered freedom from the “second death” (Rev 2:11), an idea played out in Rev 20:14. Those in Sardis are promised a place in the “book of life” (3:5), which is also found at the end of Revelation (20:12, 15; 21:27). To the Philadelphians is offered a place in the temple and the new Jerusalem that comes down from heaven (3:12), the very topic at hand. And to the Laodiceans Jesus promises a seat on his throne, the throne that sits in the center of the city in Rev 22:3.

¹²⁶ The focus here, with regard to the Edenic traditions about the tree of life, will be primarily on the Jewish-minded reader for obvious reasons. The final paragraph of this *topos* does recognize that the GR-minded reader would have likely heard (along with the Jewish-minded reader) a reference to utopian abundance in that the tree produces year-round.

¹²⁷ For this reason, the arguments of Labahn are not persuasive (“Ausharren im Leben, um vom Baum des Lebens zu essen und ewig zu leben: zur Textform und Auslegung der Paradiesgeschichte der Genesis in der Apokalypse des Johannes und deren Textgeschichte,” in *Florilegium Lovaniense: Studies in Septuagint and Tetral Criticism in Honour of Florentino García Martínez* [ed. H. Auloes, B. Lemmelijn, and M. Vervenne; Leuven: Peeters, 2008], 291–316). Labahn proceeds by analyzing the textual similarities between Revelation (2:7 and 22:2) and passages from Genesis 2–3. He concludes that John places a “Prätext in einen neuen Textzusammenhang,” i.e. John intentionally reimagines the garden of Eden narrative as in an eschatological setting (not to mention “Christian”) (“Ausharren im Leben,” 315). The problem, however, is that John is not only dependent upon Genesis here but clearly has in mind other traditions that differ from the Genesis Eden, most importantly Ezek 47 but perhaps the *Book of Watchers* as well (esp. chs. 24–25).

¹²⁸ See chapter three, “Food” under the section “The food of Eden and the two trees.” For the conclusion that the tree of life is future oriented and the tree of knowledge is seen in retrospect, this work owes a debt to Benedikt Otzen, (“The Paradise Trees in Jewish Apocalyptic,” in *Apocryphon Severini: Presented to Søren Giversen* [ed. P. Bilde, H. K. Nielsen, J. Podemann Sørensen; Aarhus, Denmark: Aarhus University Press, 1993], 141).

to “live forever” (e.g. 4 *Ezra* 8.52; 2 *En.* 8.3; *T. Levi* 18.10; *G.L.A.E.* 28.3–4). In this way, the presence of the tree of life in Revelation 21–22 (and the promise of it in Rev 2:7) indicates that eternal life is once again open to the righteous, a fact that coheres with the removal of Death and Hades from the new heaven and the new earth (Rev 20:14; 21:4).

In no known Jewish texts does the tree of life produce multiple kinds of fruits, a fact that might leave some Jewish-minded readers surprised to hear that the new Jerusalem’s tree of life produces twelve kinds of fruit. The number twelve has obvious significance in Revelation (and Judaism at large), and John uses the number licentiously when writing about the new Jerusalem. The city has twelve gates with twelve angels, one on each gate, and each gate is inscribed with the name of one of the twelve tribes of Israel (21:12). The wall of the city has twelve foundations with the twelve apostles’ names inscribed on them (21:14), the city measures twelve thousand stadia (21:16), the wall measures one hundred forty-four cubits or twelve times twelve (21:17), and the city is adorned with twelve large pearls acting as the cities gates (21:21).¹²⁹ Even the most imperceptive reader could not miss the repeated use of the number twelve as a staple of the new Jerusalem, and that the tree of life produces twelve kinds of fruit would be another example of John’s use of the symbolic number twelve. The exact significance of this number, on the other hand, is debatable, though it likely connotes completeness or perfection.¹³⁰

One last observation regards the expectation of utopian abundance in the afterlife. There is no season in which the tree lies fallow, but it produces all year long. That the tree of life produces food year-round would likely have been understood as utopian motif of natural fecundity, a motif found throughout Jewish and Greco-Roman traditions, and one that undoubtedly continues into the Christian tradition as well. For example, in the Greco-Roman tradition, Iambulus describes an island with a climate so temperate that “the fruits in their island ripen throughout the entire year.”¹³¹ An example from the Jewish tradition comes from the *Book of Watchers*: “And of every seed that is sown on [the earth], each measure

¹²⁹ This is not to mention the numerous examples of twelve elsewhere in Revelation (7:4–8; 12:1; 14:1, 3).

¹³⁰ Ian Boxall, *The Revelation of St. John* (BNTC 18; London: Continuum, 2006), 91; James L. Resseguie, *The Revelation of John: A Narrative Commentary* (Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament; Grand Rapids: Baker, 2009), 52; Grant R. Osborne, *Revelation* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2002), 17.

¹³¹ Iambulus as told by Diodorus (2.56.7). See also 2.59.1 where he remarks on the island’s “abundant provision.”

will yield a thousand measures, and each measure of olives will yield ten baths of oil" (10.19). Finally, from a Christian writer of the second century, Papias writes: "The days are coming when vines will come forth, each with ten thousand boughs; and on a single bough will be ten thousand branches. And indeed, on a single branch will be ten thousand shoots and on every shoot ten thousand clusters; and in every cluster will be ten thousand grapes, and every grape, when pressed, will yield twenty-five measures of wine" (Papias, *fragments* 1.2 [Ehrman, LCL]).¹³² The motif of utopian abundance is one found in a broad range of traditions and would have certainly been heard by John's Jewish and Gentile audiences alike.

4.3.7. *Pleasant Fragrances*

Whether in the fragrant trees mentioned throughout 1 *Enoch* or the rivers of perfume (myrrh) that surround Lucian's city on the Island of the Blessed, both the Greco-Roman and Jewish traditions know of and utilize the *topos* of a fragrant utopia. This *topos* is particularly interesting because it adds to the sensual beauty of the paradise being described through a sense other than sight. One not only *sees* the beauty of utopia but *smells* it too. Fragrance, however, is not an explicit part of John's utopia. That is to say, John nowhere in Revelation 21–22 states outright that the locale will be sweet smelling. While it might be enticing to leave the matter lie, it is quite possible that an implicit reference to fragrance is present, one not mentioned in the commentaries, but one that would have been heard by the Jewish-minded reader attuned to traditions about the tree of life.

In the Edenic description of Rev 22:1–5, John locates the tree of life in the center of the city, sitting amidst or on each side of the river of life, and the leaves of which are said to be for the "healing of the nations" (Rev 22:2). While many commentators ask the question of why healing is necessary in the eschaton,¹³³ and almost all make note of the fact that John has here added "the nations" to Ezekiel's vision (Ezek 47:12), no commentators ask the question: *How* do the leaves provide healing? Are the leaves eaten? Are they boiled and infused in water like a tea? Do the leaves take on human characteristics and bow down and physically do the work of praying for the nations, similar to what one finds in the

¹³² *Apoc. Paul* 22 contains a near-identical account that is set in the city of Christ, the authors version of the new Jerusalem.

¹³³ Beale, *The Book of Revelation*, 1108; Witherington, *Revelation*, 272–73.

Apocalypse of Paul?¹³⁴ Do the leaves contain a healing salve?¹³⁵ Or, more likely, do the leaves heal through their fragrance? What follows is a case for the last option.

For many of John's Jewish-minded readers, the tree of life would evoke a string of traditions. One tradition that was widely popular holds that the trees of Eden, and the tree of life in particular, are believed to be sweet smelling. For example, 1 *Enoch* contains a description of the primeval garden of Eden, a place no longer inhabited and still housing the tree of knowledge, a place and its tree that are noted for its sweet-smelling fragrance (1 *En.* 32.5). Pseudo-Philo mentions paradise and the "scent of its fruit" (*L.A.B.* 32.8); 2 *Enoch* 8.3 states that the pleasant fragrance of the tree of life is "indescribable";¹³⁶ and in *G.L.A.E.*, Adam is granted to bring one thing out of Eden: "aromatic fragrances" (*G.L.A.E.* 29.3–6).¹³⁷

The idea that the garden's fragrance involves a healing, of sorts, can be found in a few places, for example 4 *Ezra* 2.12:¹³⁸ "The tree of life shall give them fragrant perfume, and they shall neither toil nor become weary." It is

¹³⁴ In the fourth- or fifth-century document, *The Apocalypse of Paul*, the author relates a lengthy description of the locale of the blessed afterlife, which is informed by various sources, one of which is without doubt Revelation 21–22. In it he describes trees that sit inside the gate of the entrance to the "city of Christ" (perhaps the equivalent of the new Jerusalem), trees without fruit and "only leaves." He then writes: "And I saw a few men scattered about among the trees and they wept greatly when they saw anyone enter into the city. And the trees did penance for them by abasing themselves and bowing down and by raising themselves up again" (*Apoc. Paul* 24 [Duensing and Otero]). Whether the author has the tree of life in view here is doubtful given the location of these penitent trees at the city gate rather than the city's center, but one should not immediately discredit the association on account of this given that the apocalypse does not contain a clear reference to the tree(s) of life. The closest it comes to such a reference is overabundant palm trees and vines in *Apoc. Paul* 22 (cf. Ellen Bradshaw Aitken, "The Landscape of Promise in the Apocalypse of Paul," in *Walk in the Ways of Wisdom: Essays in Honor of Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza* [ed. S. Matthews et al.; Harrisburg, Penn.: Trinity Press International, 2003], 161).

¹³⁵ This is another viable option, though it cannot be pursued here. For a connection between oil, healing, and trees of Eden, see 2 *En.* 22.9; *G.L.A.E.* 36; *Vita* 9 (cf. Andrei A. Orlov, *The Enoch-Metatron Tradition* [TSAJ 107; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005], 229–31). One might even wish to connect the healing leaves of Rev 21:2 with the instructions in the letter to Laodicea for the recipients to anoint their eyes with a salve so that they might see (Rev 3:18). Given the preponderance of ways in which the letters of Revelation 2–3 reappear in Revelation 21–22, this is plausible; unfortunately, there are few markers in either the letters or Revelation 22 to suggest such a connection.

¹³⁶ This is true of both the longer and shorter recensions.

¹³⁷ See also 4 *Ezra* 2.12; 6.44; *Apoc. Pet.* 16; 3 *En.* 23.18.

¹³⁸ This portion of 4 *Ezra* is understood by most scholars to be from a later, Christian, redaction, and thus postdates Revelation (Metzger, *OTP* 1:517). For this reason, this passage might offer an example of how the tree of life in Revelation 22 might have been heard.

worth highlighting that the editor/author of 4 *Ezra* makes no mention of the fruit of the tree but instead remarks only on its fragrance. The result of the tree's aroma appears to be linked to reduced toil and weariness, ideas that are associated with healing and wholeness. Another example of fragrances closely linked to healing in the eschaton comes from 2 *Baruch*: "For winds will go out in front of me every morning to bring the fragrance of aromatic fruits and clouds at the end of the day to distill the dew of health" (2 *Bar.* 29.7). This passage describes a time that will precede the final eschatological judgment; nevertheless, it is eschatological insofar as it envisions a future time that is closely related to the eschaton. At this time the fragrance of fruit and the dew of clouds are linked to the health and healing.¹³⁹

But the most persuasive example of the healing powers of a fragrant tree comes from 1 *Enoch* 24–25, a tree that has important ties to the tree of life in Revelation 22. In chapter three, it is noted that the tree mentioned here is often thought to be a description of the tree of life.¹⁴⁰ Arguments for this position, however, are not convincing. Nevertheless, that this tree was understood as the tree of life by early readers of 1 *Enoch* is almost certain given that translations into Greek and Ethiopic mistakenly say the tree's fruit is "food for life" rather than the earlier Aramaic "food for the chosen" effectively connecting the tree of 1 *Enoch* 24–25 to the tree of

¹³⁹ Many of Revelation's auditors, both Jewish- and GR-minded, likely would have heard the connection between fragrance and a *dystopian* reality in John's description of the lake of fire. In Revelation, the godless are said to be thrown into a "lake that burns with fire and sulfur [θεῖον]" (21:8; see also 14:10; 19:20; 20:10). The burning of sulfur produces a noxious odor that often portends trouble, both in the Jewish and Greco-Roman traditions. Fire and sulfur have a rich history as tools of judgment in Jewish literature, the most memorable example being the judgment on Sodom and Gomorrah (Gen 19:24; Deut 29:22; Job 18:15; Isa 30:33; 34:9; Ezek 28:22; Luke 17:29). 1 *Enoch* 29:2 also connects judgment and a foul odor: "And there I saw the tree of judgment (which has) the smell of rubbish" (the terrible smell of the "tree of judgment" can be contrasted with the sweet odor of other Edenic trees in the *Book of Watchers*). The link between judgment and stench can also be found in the Greco-Roman tradition. For example, in Lucian's *A True Story*, as the crew sails toward the island of punishment, the mirror image of the Island of the Blessed from which they had just come, the combination of sulfur (θεῖον) and roasting human flesh creates a stench that alerts them that the island is nearby. Therefore, it is quite likely that a first-century audience, both Jewish-minded and GR-minded, would have not only *heard* Revelation's fire and sulfur as judgment against the unrighteous, they also would have *smelled* it.

¹⁴⁰ Pierre Grelot, "La géographie mythique d'Hénoch et ses sources orientales," *RB* 65 (1958): 33–69. Olson, who argues that John appeals to 1 *Enoch* 24–25 directly, states that the trees of 1 *Enoch* 24–25 and 32 are "obviously the two trees of Genesis 2–3" (Olson, "Those Who Have Not Defiled Themselves with Women," 499).

life in Genesis.¹⁴¹ Other notable features of the tree in *1 Enoch* 24–25 are: 1. “its leaves and its blossom and the tree never wither” (24.4); and 2. similar to Ezekiel 47 whose tree sits near the sanctuary, the tree in *1 Enoch* is “transplanted to the holy place by the house of God” (*1 En.* 25.5). The tree of life in Rev 22:2 shares each of these attributes of the tree in *1 Enoch*: it is a tree of life (with later interpreters of *1 Enoch*), its fruit never fails to produce,¹⁴² and the tree is near the place of God (in Revelation, this place is not the temple but the throne because there is no temple). What one finds, then, is a remarkable similarity between the tree of life as described in Rev 22:2 and the tree in *1 Enoch* 24–25.¹⁴³

The importance of *1 Enoch* 24–25 for understanding the *topos* of fragrance in Revelation comes when the author of *1 Enoch* links the fragrance of the tree to the healing and wholeness of those in the eschaton. He writes, “[The tree’s] fragrance <will be> in their bones, and they will live a long life on the earth, such as your fathers lived also in their days, and torments and plagues and suffering will not touch them” (*1 En.* 25.6). Long life and the lack of “torment,” “plague,” and “suffering” are all consistent with the idea of “healing” in Rev 22:2.¹⁴⁴ In light of *1 Enoch* 24–25, *4 Ezra* 2, and *2 Baruch* 29, it is quite likely that the leaves that “heal the nations” in Rev 22:2 would be heard as fragrant leaves connected to traditions about the fragrant nature of the tree of life.

In conclusion, though Revelation 21–22 does not explicitly note that the tree of life emits a pleasant fragrance, it is entirely likely that the strength of the tradition surrounding the tree of life vis-à-vis its sweet-smelling fragrance would have propelled John’s Jewish-minded readers to think of the leaves that heal the nations in terms of fragrant leaves. At the same time, John’s GR-minded readers, despite looking for a fragrant afterlife—a

¹⁴¹ See Veronika Bachmann, “Rooted in Paradise? The Meaning of the ‘Tree of Life’ in *1 Enoch* 24–25 Reconsidered,” *JSP* 19 (2009): 90, n. 17; Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch* 1, 313.

¹⁴² Though Ezek 47:12 and *1 En.* 24.4 use the language of “withering” and Rev 22:2 does not, Revelation accounts for the intent of these passages by noting that the tree produces fruit each month.

¹⁴³ Olson astutely makes this connection, though he argues that John knew and deliberately used *1 Enoch* (Olson, “Those Who Have Not Defiled Themselves with Women,” 498–500). Instead, it is better to take one step back and suggest John knew the same tradition of *1 Enoch*; that he used *1 Enoch* is doubtful.

¹⁴⁴ One might wish to argue that missing from *1 Enoch* 24–25, of course, is any reference to “the nations.” This phrase, however, is exactly what John has clearly added to Ezekiel’s language in 47:12, and so it should come as no surprise that it is additional to what is found in *1 Enoch* as well.

prevalent *topos* in Greco-Roman utopianism—would likely miss any subtle hint at a fragrant tree of life.

4.3.8. *Music*

That the book of Revelation is filled with song has not gone unnoticed by biblical scholars.¹⁴⁵ Indeed, Craig Koester remarks that “music plays a larger role in the book of Revelation than in any other book of the New Testament.”¹⁴⁶ Musical references are almost always connected to the act of worship, an act that typically takes place in the heavenly realm. In John’s vision of God’s throne room in chapter 4, for example, the twenty-four elders and the four living creatures praise God for his holiness, glory, honor and power (4:8, 11). In ch. 5, this same “ensemble” sings a “new song,” this time to the Lamb who is also on the throne (5:9; cf. 14:3; 15:3). As the chapter continues, the size of the ensemble grows, first adding “thousands of thousands” of angels (5:11), and by the end of the chapter, the entire cosmos is added: all three tiers (heaven, earth, and under the earth) and all creatures contained therein (both living and dead, i.e. those “in the sea”) are singing to God and to the Lamb. They sing, “blessing and honor and glory and might forever and ever!” (Rev 5:13). The grandeur of the scene is remarkable! In an image that blurs all boundaries of time and space, *all* peoples of *all* times stand together and worship God and the Lamb.¹⁴⁷

Despite the splendor of such a scene, it can only be understood as a prophetic vision of what is to come, for at this point in the revelation,

¹⁴⁵ Edouard Cothenet, “Earthly and Heavenly Liturgy According to the Book of Revelation,” in *Roles in the Liturgical Assembly* (tr. M. J. O’Connell; New York: Pueblo, 1981), 115–35; Gerhard Delling, “Zum Gottesdienstlichen Stil der Johannesapokalypse,” *NovT* 3 (1959): 107–37; Michael A. Harris, “The Literary Function of Hymns in the Apocalypse of John,” (Ph.D. diss., Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1989); Klaus-Peter Jöns, *Das hymnische Evangelium: Untersuchungen zu Aufbau, Funktion und Herkunft der hymnischen Stücke in der Johannesoffenbarung* (SNT 5; Gütersloher: Gerd Mohn, 1971); Craig R. Koester, “The Distant Triumph Song: Music and the Book of Revelation,” *WW* 12 (1992): 243–49; John J. O’Rourke, “The Hymns of the Apocalypse,” *CBQ* 30 (1968): 399–409; Pierre Prigent, *Apocalypse et Liturgie* (Cahiers Théologiques 52; Neuchâtel: Editions Delachaux et Niestlé, 1964).

¹⁴⁶ Koester, “The Distant Triumph Song,” 243.

¹⁴⁷ The similarities with Ps 22:27–29 are worth noting: “All the ends of the earth shall remember and turn to the LORD; and all the families of the nations shall worship before him. For dominion belongs to the LORD, and he rules over the nations. To him, indeed, shall all who sleep in the earth bow down; before him shall bow all who go down to the dust, and I shall live for him.” Cf. Ps 47:7–9; 86:9; 102:21–22; 122:3–4; 138:4–5; Isa 66:23; Zech 14:16–17.

Babylon is still in control, the Beast is alive and well, and there are many who do not entertain the thought of God's glory and power. As Koester notes, "These songs, which beckon readers to join in the chorus, are the songs of a disputed sovereignty."¹⁴⁸ John's readers, past and present, live in a world in which God's sovereignty is questioned.

Throughout the first twenty chapters of Revelation, the act of worship takes place as God sits on his throne in heaven (e.g. 4:10; 5:14; 7:11; 11:16). The heavenly locale of God obscures him from the view of the world, a world that often supplants the power of God with the power of Babylon. However, in the new Jerusalem, the throne of God is no longer in the heavens but is part of the architecture of the eternal city and the source of the river of the water of life. As with previous mentions of worship in Revelation, worship in the new Jerusalem takes place before the throne (Rev 22:3–5). The main difference between the worship in Revelation 22 and worship as found in other passages (particularly chs. 4–5) is the location of God and the throne. In the new Jerusalem, God is no longer hidden away in the heavens, separated from humanity, and worshipped only by angels and a select group of humans. In the new Jerusalem, God is present among all peoples and all nations.¹⁴⁹ As Fekkes notes, "The final words of 22.5, 'they shall reign forever and ever,' heralds the fulfillment of the expectation of 5.10, 'they shall reign on earth.'"¹⁵⁰ God's sovereignty is no longer disputed.

Given that both Jewish and Greco-Roman traditions contain utopian traditions in which music is present in the form of worship, it is likely that both groups would expect worship and song in the eschatological utopia. In chapter two, we saw that the Hyperboreans were known for their close relationship to the gods and were believed to have introduced music to the world for the purpose of worshiping the gods.¹⁵¹ Similarly, Virgil notes that priests will be singing as a form of worship in Elysium (*Aen.* 6.645–647). In Jewish tradition, there are an abundance of examples of worship as part of utopia. Praise is often done in the context of God's

¹⁴⁸ Koester, "The Distant Triumph Song," 244.

¹⁴⁹ Fekkes remarks, "The events of Rev. 21–22 represent the final universal fulfillment of John's initial scene of divine worship (4.9, 11; cf. 5.12–13), where and lead the list of spiritual offerings, and which is proleptically illustrated by the worship of the international multitude of 7.9–12" (*Isaiah and Prophetic Tradition*, 99 n. 78; cf. McKelvey, *The New Temple*, 173–75).

¹⁵⁰ Fekkes, *Isaiah and Prophetic Tradition*, 101.

¹⁵¹ Pausanias, *Graec. Descr.* 10.5.8; Pindar, *Pyth.* 10.38–39; Aelian, *Nat. an.* 11.1; Diodorus Siculus, 2.47.3.

saving activity in the world: "Sing praises to the LORD, for he has done gloriously; let this be known in all the earth. Shout aloud and sing for joy, O royal Zion, for great in your midst is the Holy One of Israel" (Isa 12:5–6). Perhaps the most apt parallel of utopian worship comes from Isa 26:1–2: "On that day this song will be sung in the land of Judah: We have a strong city; he sets up victory like walls and bulwarks. Open the gates, so that the righteous nation that keeps faith may enter in."¹⁵² John's vision of the new Jerusalem is the fulfillment of the song of Isaiah 26 complete with strong walls, gates, and righteous nations streaming into it.

Greco-Roman and Jewish traditions alike have expectations about how one is to answer the question, What will one *hear* in utopia? John answers this question in a way that is at home in both traditions by envisioning an eschatological utopia where the sweets songs of worship will fill the ears of its inhabitants.¹⁵³

4.3.9. *Light*

Light is a crucial element in John's description of the new Jerusalem. Two issues present themselves: first, the idea that the eschatological utopia is without darkness, and, second, the importance of glory in understanding John's use of light imagery. Interestingly, the Greco-Roman tradition has very little by way of expectations regarding light in utopia. For this reason, comments on the Greco-Roman tradition will be interspersed within the comments about Jewish light traditions.

4.3.9.1. *Perpetual Light*

John twice notes that there will be no night in the new Jerusalem (21:25; 22:5) and twice mentions that there will be no need for sun, moon, or lamp because God and the Lamb will be the source of light (21:23; 22:5). The notion that the eschaton will be a place of perpetual light is not unique to John, however. Particularly for the Jewish-minded auditor, John's description resonates with expectations regarding light in the eschaton. In many

¹⁵² For other examples of music, see Isa 25:1; Jer 31:4; Zeph 3:14–20; *Sib. Or.* 5.263, 267, 428; Josephus, *Ant.* 8.102; 2 *En.* 8.8; 31.1; 42.4.

¹⁵³ Perhaps unfortunately, one does not find in the new Jerusalem the Greco-Roman tradition that emphasizes the general pleasantness of song in utopia, a pleasantness that parallels the *topos* of fragrance in that it adds to the sensual beauty of utopia in a way other than through sight. Despite modern colloquial visions of angels with harps, John does not mention the music of instruments, nor does he mention the natural music of birds and nature.

passages from both the Hebrew Scriptures and Second Temple Jewish literature, one finds the perpetual presence of light as a common way of describing utopia.¹⁵⁴ However, of all these passages, Isa 60:19–20 has significant commonalities with Revelation's description: "The sun shall no longer be your light by day, nor for brightness shall the moon give light to you by night; but the LORD will be your everlasting light, and your God will be your glory. Your sun shall no more go down, or your moon withdraw itself; for the LORD will be your everlasting light, and your days of mourning shall be ended." The commonalities include the following: first, both authors explicitly cite the sun and moon as no longer necessary for light. Second, both authors state that it is God who is the new light source. Interestingly, Isaiah refers to the light source as "the LORD" and "God," both certainly references to the same being, while John refers to two different figures, God and the Lamb. Third, the glory of God is significant for both authors and is part of their complexes of light imagery. Fourth, both authors also mention the eternality of this light source. For Isaiah, the LORD is the everlasting light, and for John, God and the Lamb reign forever (Rev 22:5).

The Greco-Roman tradition has fewer references to light in the afterlife, and in only one example is perpetual light said to be an aspect of utopia. In Lucian's *True Story* the lighting of the Island of the Blessed is described not with a brightness—as one finds in the Jewish tradition—but with a light that is not too bright and not too dim; it is the light like one experiences in the morning before the sun has risen (*Ver. hist.* 2.12). Beyond Lucian's use of light imagery, however, the Greco-Roman tradition has little to say about perpetual light.¹⁵⁵

4.3.9.2. *Glory*

The term "glory" (δόξα) appears four times in the final two chapters of Revelation, twice referring to the glory of God (21:11, 23), once to the glory of the kings (21:24), and once to the glory of the nations (21:26). Revelation 21:11 records John's first glimpse of the new Jerusalem coming down out of heaven. The first phrase he uses to describe the city is that it has the

¹⁵⁴ Isa 30:26; Zech 14:7; 1 En. 50.1; 58.6; 2 En. 65.9–10; 2 Bar. 48.50; 4 Ezra 2:35; Sib. Or. 2.316, 325–329; 3.787; 4.191; 5.476–483; L.A.B. 51.5; Jub. 1.29; G.L.A.E. 36.1–3; Apoc. Zeph. 2.6–7; 3 En. 5.1–6.

¹⁵⁵ The closest one finds is not perpetual light comes from Pindar's description of the blessed afterlife in which "the sun shin[es] for evermore, for equal nights and equal days" (*Ol.* 2.61–62 [Race, LCL]).

“glory of God,” upon which he further elaborates with light imagery saying it has a “radiance [φωσθήρ] like a very rare jewel.” As mentioned above, the glory of God in Rev 21:23 is cited as the source of the new Jerusalem’s light. Clearly the two references to God’s glory are tightly bound to the *topos* of light.

Interesting, from the viewpoint of the Jewish-minded reader, is that the other two mentions of glory in Revelation 21–22 are in reference not to God, not even to Israel, but to the nations and their kings. That John would ascribe glory to the nations and their kings is indeed telling and would be heard by many Jewish-minded auditors as an affront to an exclusivist position of Israel and the eschaton. The glory of God that lights the new Jerusalem will be joined by the glory of the nations and their kings which will presumably contribute to the source of light that shines forever without night.

The perceptive Jewish-minded reader would likely hear echoes of Isa 60:1–5.¹⁵⁶

Arise, shine; for your light has come, and the glory of the LORD has risen upon you. For darkness shall cover the earth, and thick darkness the peoples; but the LORD will arise upon you, and his glory will appear over you. Nations [גוים; LXX ἔθνη] shall come to your light, and kings [מלכים; LXX βασιλείς] to the brightness of your dawn. Lift up your eyes and look around; they all gather together, they come to you; your sons shall come from far away, and your daughters shall be carried on their nurses’ arms. Then you shall see and be radiant; your heart shall thrill and rejoice, because the abundance of the sea shall be brought to you, the wealth of the nations shall come to you.

This passage from Isaiah includes a reference to the glory of God, the light of which shines from Jerusalem over all the earth, drawing nations and kings to it. Revelation 21:24 also contains nations (ἔθνη) and kings (βασιλείς) being drawn to the light of God’s glory, set, of course, in Jerusalem (cf. *Pss. Sol.* 17.31; Tob 13.11).¹⁵⁷

Startling, however, is the notion that the kings in Revelation also bring their own “glory” into Jerusalem (stated twice: 21:24, 26). Other mentions of “kings” in Revelation are not so generous (e.g. in Rev 16:14 demonic spirits gather the kings of the world to do battle against God) with the

¹⁵⁶ See also the discussion of this text under the *topos* “Wealth.” Cf. Aune, *Revelation* 17–22, 1169–70; Beale, *Book of Revelation*, 1094.

¹⁵⁷ In Bar 5:1–9, it is the exiled of Israel that return to Jerusalem via the light of God’s glory.

majority of references being negative.¹⁵⁸ In fact, outside of the final two chapters, kings are not once mentioned in an overtly positive way making the reference to their glory in Rev 21:24 and 21:26 all the more odd.¹⁵⁹ Despite the shockingly positive portrayal of the nations and kings in the new Jerusalem, a point that surely betrays John's inclusivist agenda,¹⁶⁰ the "glory" of the nations should not necessarily be equated with the "glory" of God. Aune argues that the word pair "glory and honor" (used together in 21:16) is "widely used in antiquity to connote fame and reputation."¹⁶¹ To this should be added that, as noted above, the glory of the nations and their kings is likely a reference to their wealth, or more specifically, that product for which a nation is known.¹⁶² In Isaiah 60, the "glory" of Lebanon is its wood, a product for which it is widely known.

In conclusion, the perpetual light of the new Jerusalem is an idea popular in Jewish eschatological utopias. So also, glory is a common term used to describe the radiance of God and the beauty of the eschaton. That this term is applied to the nations and the kings is somewhat odd, considering John's overtly negative portrayal of them throughout Revelation, but it is in keeping with its usage in traditions about a worldwide eschatological pilgrimage.

4.3.10. *Climate*

John does not explicitly appeal to the climate of the new Jerusalem as a way of talking about its beauty and grandeur. The Jewish tradition says very little about climate in utopia. The Greco-Roman tradition, on the other hand, has much to say about climate such that it is one of the over-riding *topoi* that defines utopia. The temperateness of utopia plays such a large role for the Greco-Roman utopia that one might even be inclined to read it into the scenario where it is not explicit. The most likely place for this to happen in Revelation 21–22 is in 22:2 in concert with the tree of life that produces an abundant amount of fruit since, in much Greco-Roman

¹⁵⁸ See also Rev 1:5; 6:15; 17:2, 18; 18:3, 9; 19:19; 21:24.

¹⁵⁹ Mathewson piles on by suggesting that the negative view of kings is consistent with the Hebrew Scriptures, citing Ps 2:2 and Isa 24:23 (*A New Heaven and a New Earth*, 169). Such "consistency" in the Hebrew Scripture is not convincing, however, since the Hebrew Scriptures often uses kings positively as examples of greatness (Pss 45:8–9; 72:10–11; 102:15; 136:17–18; 138:4; 148:11; Isa 60:3, 10, 11, 16; 62:2; Jer 25:14, 18; Hab 1:10).

¹⁶⁰ See the *topos* "Citizens: Inclusivism/Exclusivism."

¹⁶¹ Aune, *Revelation 17–22*, 1173. Cf. Pss 8:5; 28:1; 95:7 Job 37:22; 1 Macc 14:21; Rom 2:7, 10; Justin, *Dial.* 73.3; Plutarch, *Camillus* 25.1; *Pelopidas* 34.5; etc.

¹⁶² See above under the *topos* "Wealth" for a discussion of "glory" in light of Isaiah 60.

literature, the two *topoi* go hand-in-hand. For example, commenting on the beauty of an unidentified utopian island, Diodorus notes that “the climate of this island is so altogether mild that it produces in abundance the fruits of the trees and the other seasonal fruits for the larger part of the year, so that it would appear that the island, because of its exceptional felicity, were a dwelling-place of a race of gods and not of men” (5.19.5). Because of the strong presence of temperate climates in Greco-Roman utopias and the robust connection between utopian abundance and the temperate climate, it is quite likely the GR-minded reader would have read the utopian abundance provided by the tree of life as a signal for a moderate climate.

4.3.11. *War and Peace*

The presence of peace and the absence of war is a *topos* found in both Greco-Roman and Jewish utopian descriptions. Both groups consistently describe utopian life as peaceful, and it is one of the more prevalent *topoi* in all expressions of utopianism. Though there is no explicit reference to war, violence, or combat in the last two chapters of Revelation, it is still quite likely that an ancient auditor would be listening for this expectation. They would indeed find it in three places.

First, Rev 21:4 sets up an expectation that “death will be no more,” along with crying, pain, mourning, etc. On the one hand, the Jewish-minded reader would likely hear echoes of Isa 25:8, but on the other hand, the absence of death might also be heard as an end to war, a large cause of death in the ancient world. The GR-minded reader would hear similarly.

Second, Revelation’s new Jerusalem has high walls, gates, and angels positioned at each gate likely as guards of the city (Rev 21:12).¹⁶³ These features of the new Jerusalem, as with most cities in the ancient world, are designed to protect its inhabitants from the threat of foreigners. And yet there is a tinge of irony in the descriptions of the city’s protective structures in that the author goes on to say that the “nations” and the “kings of the earth” will be walking into the city with regularity, and even more ironic, the “pearly” gates will “never be shut by day” (21:25). Even the qualifier, “by day,” however, is unnecessary given that John immediately remarks that there will be no night in that world suggesting the gates will be open at all times. John’s portrait of the new Jerusalem, then, is a

¹⁶³ See above under *topos* “Setting” and subsection “Laus urbis” for angels as guardians of the city.

utopian city that requires no protection (despite its ability to do so) and invites foreigners and outsiders from all nations to partake in the glories of the city. Such a depiction necessitates a world in which war is no longer a possibility.¹⁶⁴

Third, Rev 22:3 reads: καὶ πᾶν κατάθεμα οὐκ ἔσται ἔτι. The NRSV translates this phrase, “Nothing accursed will be found there any more.” The term κατάθεμα is a *hapax legomena*, not found anywhere else in the New Testament or the LXX. It shares similarities with both ἀνάθεμα, “curse,” and κατάρα, “curse.” As many have argued, this verse shares similarities to Zech 14:11: “And it shall be inhabited, for never again shall it be doomed to destruction (וְהָיָה יְרוּשָׁלַם לֹא יִהְיֶה עוֹד; LXX οὐκ ἔσται ἀνάθεμα ἔτι); Jerusalem shall abide in security” (NRSV).¹⁶⁵ The Hebrew חֵרֶם can mean “curse” or “accursed,” and thus the LXX translation ἀνάθεμα. However, it can also mean, “devoted to destruction,” and is a term closely associated with the divine command to wage war, often called “the ban” (cf. esp. Joshua where the term is used no less than twenty two times). Aune concludes, “κατάθεμα is the author’s way of interpreting חֵרֶם *hērem*. Thus the word refers not generally to curses, accursed things, or persons but specifically to the promise that ‘the curse of war’ will no longer exist.”¹⁶⁶ Aune’s reading of this passage (particularly as it applies to a Jewish-minded reader) is persuasive, especially in light of the prevalence of the utopian *topos* of peace. It should be stated, however, that this reading requires a keen knowledge of the textual intricacies of Zech 14:11 including the Hebrew חֵרֶם and its significance. This would limit the probability that even a perceptive Jewish-minded reader would have heard such resonances. Instead, it is quite possible that a second resonance would be heard.

As noted below under the *topos* “Work,” this passage opens itself to, at least, two legitimate interpretations; i.e. κατάθεμα can be both a reference

¹⁶⁴ The Jewish-minded reader might hear the tradition expressed in *Sib. Or.* 3.702–709 in which war is absent because God, the only military necessary, is present in Jerusalem watching over its inhabitants.

¹⁶⁵ Aune, *Revelation* 17–22, 1178–79. See also Jauhiainen, *The Use of Zechariah in Revelation*, 125–26; Beale, *Book of Revelation*, 1102; Richard Bauckham, *The Climax of Prophecy: Studies on the Book of Revelation* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1993), 316–18. The question of whether John uses the Hebrew text or a Greek translation when alluding to the Hebrew Scriptures is still an open question since John never quotes directly from any source (though recent scholarship seems to favor the MT; cf. Mathewson, *A New Heaven and a New Earth*, 26 n. 87; Paulien, “Dreading the Whirlwind,” 5–6; both contain significant bibliography). The verbal parallels between the Greek in these passages (Rev 22:3 and Zech 14:11) are evident, though the word order is slightly different.

¹⁶⁶ Aune, *Revelation* 17–22, 1179.

to the “curse of war,” as Aune argues, or to the Edenic curse directed at Adam and Eve in Gen 3:14–24.¹⁶⁷ Both readings are tenable, and both would have been heard by Jewish-minded readers listening with Jewish resonances, but it seems the Edenic curse would have been the louder echo given the intricate nature of the argument above and for reasons mentioned below. Nevertheless, a legitimate Jewish-minded reading of Rev 22:3 might produce the following translation: “The ‘curse of war’ will no longer be found there.”

4.3.12. *Citizens*

4.3.12.1. *Righteousness and Purity*

John writes that nothing unclean (πᾶν κοινὸν) will enter into the new Jerusalem, nor will anyone who practices abomination or falsehood (Rev 21:27). By distinguishing between “nothing unclean” and those who practice unclean acts, John appears to be covering all manner of impurities, both people and objects, so as to further emphasize the purity of the new Jerusalem.¹⁶⁸ Aune argues that the term was once a religious category denoting ritual cleanness (Lev 10:10; 1 Macc 1:47, 62; 4 Macc 7:6) but in early Christianity and beyond, the term is used to describe one’s morality and righteousness (Matt 15:11, 18, 20; Heb 9:13; Acts 10:14; Rom 14:14).¹⁶⁹ As noted in chapters two and three, righteousness in utopia is a common expectation for both Greco-Roman and Jewish utopianism, and both the Jewish- and GR-minded auditors would have been ready for such an eschaton.

4.3.12.2. *Inclusivism/Exclusivism*

The question of whether utopia includes or excludes Gentiles is, for obvious reasons, one that only makes sense in the context of Jewish tradition. The GR-minded auditor is not likely to raise this issue and is likely to assume he or she will certainly have a presence in the eschaton. Jewish tradition is less certain about this assumption, and the variety of Jewish views on the matter inform how John’s Jewish-minded auditors would

¹⁶⁷ See below for this reading of Rev 22:3. Cf. Pierre Prigent, *Commentary on the Apocalypse*, 627; Mitchell G. Reddish, *Revelation* (Smyth & Helwys Bible Commentary; Macon, Ga.: Smyth & Helwys, 2001), 421; Witherington, *Revelation*, 273.

¹⁶⁸ Jan Fekkes, *Isaiah and Prophetic Traditions in the Book of Revelation*, 274.

¹⁶⁹ Aune, *Revelation* 17–22, 1174.

have heard certain passages from Revelation. For this reason, this section will be focused on Jewish traditions regarding Gentiles in utopia.

Biblical scholars have noted for some time the tension that exists in Revelation with regard to the “conversion of the nations.”¹⁷⁰ On the one hand, the nations and their kings are portrayed negatively throughout the book of Revelation and are judged severely.¹⁷¹ On the other hand, when John turns to describing the eschatological utopia of the new Jerusalem, he makes a point to recognize the presence of the nations and their kings. The nations walk by the light of God and of the city, and the kings “bring their glory into it” (Rev 21:24; cf. 21:26; 22:2). In light of this tension, Revelation as a whole is often caricatured in two incompatible ways. First, some have described the Apocalypse as a violent book that is overly concerned with revenge and filled with troubling bloodlust.¹⁷² Others, however, read Revelation as a book with a universalistic message and argue that, in the end, all will be redeemed even the nations and the kings.¹⁷³ For example, Georgi, pointing to the well-documented parallels between the new Jerusalem and Babylon, argues that the new Jerusalem is none other than “Babylon *rediviva*.”¹⁷⁴ Any interpretation of the book must somehow account for this tension.

As a means of addressing the tension that exists within Revelation, scholars make various interpretive moves. One common move is to argue that the nations of Rev 21:24 and 22:2 are those redeemed from the nations and converted at some point in their lifetimes.¹⁷⁵ Not insignificant to this interpretation is Rev 5:9 in which the blood of the lamb redeems “saints

¹⁷⁰ A few of the more important contributions include: Bauckham, *The Climax of Prophecy*, 238–337 (the chapter is titled “The Conversion of the Nations”); David Mathewson, “The Destiny of the Nations in Revelation 21:1–22:5: A Reconsideration,” *TynBul* 53 (2002): 121–42; McNicol, *The Conversion of the Nations in Revelation*.

¹⁷¹ Revelation 19:15–21 contains a description of the battle between God and evil during which time God will “strike down the nations,” and the “flesh of kings” is eaten by birds sent from heaven. Further, in Rev 20:7–10, the nations are deceived by Satan who is ultimately thrown into the lake of fire along with all those who are not in the book of life (20:15). Aune, *Revelation 17–22*, 1171; Bauckham, *Climax of Prophecy*, 308–309.

¹⁷² Famously, J. A. T. Robinson states that if Revelation was not written in the context of persecution (a point most Revelation scholars today are not willing to grant), then it is “the product of a perfervid and psychotic imagination” (J. A. T. Robinson, *Redating the New Testament* [Philadelphia: Westminster, 1976], 231).

¹⁷³ See Rissi, *The Future of the World*, 68–74; Walter E. Pilgrim, “Universalism in the Apocalypse,” *WW* 9 (1983): 235–43; Wilfred J. Harrington, “Positive Eschaton Only: Revelation and Universal Salvation,” *PIBA* 15 (1992): 42–59.

¹⁷⁴ Dieter Georgi, “John’s ‘Heavenly’ Jerusalem,” 181.

¹⁷⁵ Beale, *The Book of Revelation*, 1097; Gundry, “The New Jerusalem,” 263.

from every tribe and language and people and nation." The nations in Revelation 21–22 are simply a part of this group of saints.

Second, a universalistic approach is equally as popular.¹⁷⁶ Rissi, for example, claims that those who were once in the lake of fire will make their way to the new Jerusalem whose light draws the nations to itself, whose gates are opened continuously, and whose fruit heals such people as these.¹⁷⁷ Indeed the inclusivism of John is at times striking and at times traditional. Striking is the idea expressed in Rev 21:3 that all people and all nations will be God's people. This is an echo of the covenantal formula that is always connected to Israel, but, in Rev 21:3, John universalizes it.¹⁷⁸ But sometimes his inclusivism is traditional, such as his use of the well-established tradition of a universal *Völkerwallfahrt*,¹⁷⁹ the idea that the nations and their kings will pilgrimage to the eschatological Jerusalem, in Rev 21:24–26. When set in contrast to Ezekiel's program of exclusivism, John can come across as a universalist. In fact, Vogelgesang has argued that one theme is capable of explaining every derivation John makes from the text of Ezekiel: "the universalization of the Ezekielian program resulting in the redemption of all humanity."¹⁸⁰ He continues, "All the changes present a unified picture of a New Jerusalem organized around the concept of the entire world receiving the full blessing and God being with all peoples in the new order." At risk of oversimplifying John's use of sources,

¹⁷⁶ Indeed quite a few scholars argue that John is a universalist who believes all peoples will be redeemed; cf. Vanhoye, "L'utilisation du livre d'Ezéchiél dans l'Apocalypse," 436–77; Rissi, *The Future of the World*; Vogelgesang, "The Interpretation of Ezekiel in the Book of Revelation," 128; Georgi, "John's 'Heavenly' Jerusalem," 181.

¹⁷⁷ Rissi, *Future of the World*, 78.

¹⁷⁸ Aune states that the covenant language in Rev 21:3 ("He will dwell with them; they will be his peoples") "is significant because it is applied to all people universally (n.b. the term λαοί), not just to a specific group" (Aune, *Revelation 17–22*, 1123; cf. Prigent, *Commentary on the Apocalypse*, 584; Reddish, *Revelation*, 402; Mathewson, *A New Heaven and a New Earth*, 52; see Aune for a plethora of passages from the Hebrew Scriptures that use the covenant formula). He says this because, most often, the Hebrew Scriptures uses this formula to designate God's relationship with Israel (e.g. Lev 26:12; Jer 7:23; λᾶος), but in Rev 21:3, God "tabernacles with humanity" (μετὰ τῶν ἀνθρώπων).

¹⁷⁹ Pss 22:27–29; 47:7–9; 86:9; 102:21–22; 122:3–4; 138:4–5; Isa 2:1–4; 11:10–12; 49:22–23; 56:5–8; 60:3–17; 66:18, 23; Jer 3:17; Mic 4:1–2; Zeph 3:10; Zech 8:20–23; 14:16–17; *Sib. Or.* 3:710–731; *T. Ben.* 9.2; *Pss. Sol.* 17:30–35. Cf. Mathewson, *A New Heaven and a New Earth*, 163–69; Fekkes, *Isaiah and Prophetic Traditions*, 99 n. 78. For the importance of this motif in Isaiah, see Richtsje Abma, "Travelling from Babylon to Zion: Location and its Function in Isaiah 49–55," *JSOT* 74 (1997): 3–28. See above under *topos* "Wealth."

¹⁸⁰ Vogelgesang, "The Interpretation of Ezekiel in the Book of Revelation," 131.

it appears that John employs the imagery and symbolism of Ezekiel but infuses it with the inclusivistic theology of Isaiah.¹⁸¹

Third, Bauckham attempts to take seriously the language of judgment used against the nations and kings and thus reserves a place for the judged, but importantly he gives privilege to John's eschatological vision: "Thus Revelation 22:3a recalls the judgment of the nations that worshipped the beast and opposed God's kingdom, but declares that, with the coming of God's kingdom, the nations which have been converted to the worship of God and the acknowledgment of his rule need never again fear his judgment."¹⁸² Mathewson, who largely agrees with Bauckham for taking seriously what he calls the elements of "universal judgment" (19:17–21; 20:7–10) and "universal salvation" (21:3, 24–26; 22:2) in Revelation, criticizes Bauckham for privileging the latter.¹⁸³ Ultimately Mathewson wants to retain the tension because, as he sees it, the tension itself serves a rhetorical purpose confronting the nations with two equally viable possibilities: judgment and salvation. He argues that John envisions an eschatological pilgrimage of the nations, but he does not quantify just how many will take part.

As Bauckham and Mathewson argue, it is likely that John's audience would take seriously both the judgment and the salvation of the nations. What is worth emphasizing, and perhaps is latent in Bauckham's privileging of the salvation scene, is that despite the gruesome nature of much of the Apocalypse, there is an uncompromising hopefulness about it. The hope John offers is not beyond even the most despicable of characters—for John, the kings of this world. In a dramatic turn of events, John's eschatological-utopian portrait contains a scene in which the most deplorable actors who cross the stage of Revelation are eventually welcomed into the new Jerusalem, signaling to the readers—even those in Laodicea—hope

¹⁸¹ Thus Fekkes notes that "the nationalistic plan of Ezekiel is expanded with the universalistic program of Isaiah" (*Isaiah and Prophetic Traditions*, 98). How John's Jewish-minded auditor would have heard John's reinterpretation of Ezekiel is difficult to say. Unlike modern interpreters who are trained to pit "Ezekiel's theology" against "Isaiah's theology," an ancient interpreter is less likely to make such differentiations. In this way, John and his auditors likely crafted a theological agenda and read the Hebrew Scriptures through it; in this case, it is Ezekiel read through the lens of Isaiah. It should be noted that this is not an uncommon practice today, as many interpreters of the Bible find a hermeneutical key (whether that be the Gospels, Paul's letters, the cross, etc.) and make sense of the rest of the Bible through that hermeneutic.

¹⁸² Bauckham, *Climax of Prophecy*, 318.

¹⁸³ Mathewson, "The Destiny of the Nations," 141–42.

is never lost and redemption is always possible, even for those who, like the kings and the nations, once sided with the beast.

4.3.12.3. *Clothing*

The motif of clothing is, in many respects, a subset of the motif of righteousness. Those who “persevere” or “conquer” are given white garments in the book of Revelation.¹⁸⁴ The white garments, which are common to Jewish apocalyptic imagery,¹⁸⁵ are meant as a visual symbol of the inward purity of those present in the eschatological utopia. Within the final verses of the Apocalypse, for example, John writes: “Blessed are those who wash their robes, so that they will have the right to the tree of life and may enter the city by the gates” (Rev 22:14; cf. 7:14). Here the washing of the garment symbolizes a spiritual cleansing after which one is granted access to the eternal city and the fruit of the tree of life.

4.3.12.4. *Reduced Anxiety*

John’s vision of the utopian eschaton involves a world in which despair, pain, and anxiety are absent. He writes that “[God] will wipe every tear from their eyes . . . mourning and crying and pain will be no more” (21:4).¹⁸⁶ Such statements reflect a broad Jewish expectation that the eschaton will be a time of rejoicing when Israel has been returned from exile and the people dwell with God.¹⁸⁷ The link between the absence of tears and “second exodus” is found in Isa 25:8, “Then the Lord GOD will wipe away the tears from all faces, and the disgrace of his people he will

¹⁸⁴ Rev 3:4, 5, 18; 4:4; 6:11; 7:9, 13, 14; 19:14.

¹⁸⁵ 1 En. 62:15–16; 71:1; 108:12; 2 En. 22:8–10; 2 Bar. 51:5; Apoc. Ab. 13:14; Apoc. Zeph 8:3; Ps. Sol. 11:7; T. Ab. 20:10; Ascen. Isa. 9:6–18.

¹⁸⁶ Fekkes argues that John is here alluding to Isa 65:19 based on “theme, structure, and vocabulary” of each (Fekkes, *Isaiah and Prophetic Traditions*, 255). Isaiah 65:19 is part of an extended description of the eschatological Jerusalem that is restored to its proper glory: “I will rejoice in Jerusalem, and delight in my people; no more shall the sound of weeping be heard in it, or the cry of distress.” The context of Isaiah 65–66 certainly fits Revelation 21–22, and John uses other passages from this portion of Isaiah in his description of the new Jerusalem. The terminology, however, is not as close as one might wish. Both Isaiah (LXX) and Revelation use the phrase “not yet” (οὐκ ἔτι) and “crying” (κρᾶνγῆ), but the other terms are not identical. For this reason, the allusion is weak though possible (contra Fekkes [*Isaiah and Prophetic Traditions*, 255–56] and Mathewson [*A New Heaven and a New Earth*, 59]). Instead, it is more likely that John’s readers would hear the broad tradition of reduced crying, anxiety, etc., in the eschatological utopia, a tradition well-documented in Israel’s history.

¹⁸⁷ Isa 35:4, 10; 51:11; 55:12; 60:20; 61:1–3; 65:18–19; Jer 31:13, 16; Ps 116:8. See chapter three, *topos* “Citizens: Reduced Anxiety and Increased Joy.”

take away from all the earth.”¹⁸⁸ As we saw in chapter three, reduced anxiety and increased joy is found as part of the eschaton, often in the context of return from exile. Isaiah, in particular, likes to connect the return to Zion/Jerusalem with the removal of sadness and the presence of joy.

Isaiah 35:10, “And the ransomed of the LORD shall return, and come to Zion with singing; everlasting joy shall be upon their heads; they shall obtain joy and gladness, and sorrow and sighing shall flee away.”

Isaiah 61:1–3, “The spirit of the Lord God is upon me, because the LORD has anointed me; he has sent me to bring good news to the oppressed, to bind up the broken-hearted, to proclaim liberty to the captives, and release to the prisoners; to proclaim the year of the Lord’s favor, and the day of vengeance of our God; to comfort all who mourn; to provide for those who mourn in Zion—to give them a garland instead of ashes, the oil of gladness instead of mourning, the mantle of praise instead of a faint spirit. They will be called oaks of righteousness, the planting of the Lord, to display his glory.”

Isaiah 65:18–19, “But be glad and rejoice for ever in what I am creating; for I am about to create Jerusalem as a joy, and its people as a delight. I will rejoice in Jerusalem, and delight in my people; no more shall the sound of weeping be heard in it, or the cry of distress.”

As noted under the *topos* “Rivers/Water” above, John’s reference to the sea being “no more” in Rev 21:1 would be read by a perceptive Jewish-minded reader as an allusion to second exodus. With the second exodus backdrop already set, then, Rev 21:4 would likely be understood as an effect of the exodus: i.e. one’s return from exile into the presence of God (Rev 21:3, “He will dwell with them”) is the impetus for the cessation of tears and mourning and cause for rejoicing and merriment.¹⁸⁹ The result, then, is a fundamental transformation of the person who enters the new Jerusalem from one who mourns into one who rejoices with an “everlasting joy” (Isa 35:10).

¹⁸⁸ Mathewson states that most commentators recognize John is alluding to the second half of Isa 25:8 (*A New Heaven and a New Earth*, 57–58). Mathewson suggests that John substitutes “from their eyes” for Isaiah’s “from every face” in order to “add a more personal touch . . . and to heighten the emotive appeal” (58). N.B. Revelation 21:4, “He will wipe every tear from their eyes,” can be found without alteration in Rev 7:17, both of which would likely be heard by the Jewish-minded reader as allusions to Isa 25:8 (Mathewson, *A New Heaven and a New Earth*, 59; Aune, *Revelation 17–22*, 1124; Fekkes, *Isaiah and Prophetic Traditions*, 253–54).

¹⁸⁹ This is especially the case for those who catch the chiasm of Rev 21:1–5 in which the removal of the sea (v. 1) and the cessation of tears (v. 4) share the same level of the chiasm. For the chiastic nature of Rev 21:1–5, see Ruiten, “Intertextual Relationship,” 475–77; Aune, *Revelation 17–22*, 1113–14; Fekkes, *Isaiah and Prophetic Tradition*, 258; Mathewson, *A New Heaven and a New Earth*, 33.

The Greco-Roman minded reader, however, would likely not make the connections to second exodus that his or her Jewish counterpart would. Nevertheless, reduced anxiety is a part of Greco-Roman utopian repertoire, though as noted in chapter two, it is connected primarily to the ease of life in utopia rather than return from exile and the presence of God.¹⁹⁰

4.3.13. *Work*

In chapter two, the evidence suggested that, on the whole, the Greco-Roman expectation of work in utopia is that there will be none. In contrast, the Jewish expectation was not that work is entirely absent but that work is eased. Turning to Revelation 21–22, there is one possibly explicit reference to the reduction or ease of work and another passage that may have been heard as a reference to work. The first, Rev 21:4c, concerns both the GR-minded and Jewish-minded readers, and the second, Rev 22:3, concerns the Jewish-minded reader. They will be addressed here in reverse order.

Revelation 22:3 states, “There will no longer be anything accursed” (καὶ πᾶν κατέθεμα οὐκ ἔσται ἔτι), a passage addressed above under the *topos* “War and Peace.” As noted above, the key term κατέθεμα is a *hapax* in the LXX and the New Testament and has affinities with ἀνάθεμα and κατάρα, both of which mean “curse,” the latter of which is a form of ἐπικατάρατος which appears in the curses handed out in the garden in Gen 3:14, 17.

An important argument in favor of Rev 22:3 as a reference to the Edenic curse is that John has placed this statement in the middle of his Edenic description of the new Jerusalem. In Rev 22:1 he turns to the Edenic imagery of the river and the tree of life. For the author at this point to interject the removal of the garden’s curse fits well with the surrounding context, i.e. the Edenic imagery used in the verses leading up to 22:3. Furthermore, the reversal of the “curse” of Adam and Eve in the eschatological utopia is a Jewish tradition, the best example of which comes from 2 Bar. 73.7–74.1: “Women will no longer have pain when they bear, nor will they be tormented when they yield the fruits of their womb. And it will happen in those days that the reapers will not become tired, and the farmers will not wear themselves out, because the products of themselves will shoot out speedily, during the time that they work on them in full tranquility.” Here the author envisions the end of the age when the curse placed

¹⁹⁰ See below under the *topos* “Work” for more on the GR-minded reading of Rev 21:4.

upon Adam and Eve is reversed, and the work of this utopian paradise is made easier.

The “curse” of Rev 22:3 is multivalent for the Jewish-minded reader. On the one hand, as argued above under the *topos* “War and Peace,” the removal of the curse might very well be heard as an allusion to Zech 14:11 in which the “ban” is no longer present in the eschatological utopia and the “curse of war” is removed forever. On the other hand, the removal of the curse might be heard as a reference to the Eden narrative and the reverse of God’s curse upon humanity. Both options are viable.

Revelation 22:3, however, is not the only place where eased work can be found. In Rev 21:4, the author writes that every tear (δάκρυον) will be wiped from the eyes of those entering the new Jerusalem, and “mourning (πένθος) and crying (κλαυγή) and pain (πόνος)” will be removed in the new Jerusalem, a passage touched upon under the *topos* “Citizens: Reduced anxiety.” This verse, however, more than reduced anxiety, it contains the possibility of reduced work, an idea not explored by the commentaries.

The majority of translations translate πόνος as “pain,”¹⁹¹ perhaps because of the two other usages of this term in Rev 16:10–11 where the term likely means either “affliction” or “pain.” It is more likely, however, that John’s readers would have understood πόνος in Rev 21:4 differently, i.e. as a reference to hard labor and extreme toil.¹⁹² This is particularly true if the removal of the curse in Rev 22:3 is understood as the reversal of the curse of Adam, in which case the ease of labor would be heard quite naturally in the ear of a Jewish auditor. Commentators routinely fail to recognize this possible translation for πόνος.

Two key passages are worth noting in respect to the usage of πόνος: Josephus’s account of the cursing of Adam and Eve (*Ant.* 1.49) and Isa 65:22–23 (LXX). Josephus notes that prior to Adam and Eve’s sin, the ground grew with a natural fecundity (αὐτομάτως), but after, it required great labor (πονέω).¹⁹³ Josephus does not use a term for “curse,” but πονέω essentially serves that purpose. That Josephus would choose this term to express God’s curse upon the land is not insignificant for early Jewish-minded

¹⁹¹ NRSV, ESV, NIV, ASV, KJV.

¹⁹² The only other use of πόνος in the New Testament appears in Col 4:13 where it certainly holds this meaning. BDAG has two definitions for this word: 1. “work that involves much exertion or trouble, (*hard*) labor, toil” and 2. “experience of great trouble, *pain, distress, affliction*” (852). It, inexplicably, places Rev 21:4 in the category of the second definition.

¹⁹³ Josephus, *Ant.* 1.49; cf. 1.46 in which the noun form is used as something God wishes for Adam and Eve to avoid.

readers of the Apocalypse. The removal of πόνος amounts to the removal of the curse of hard labor.

Interestingly, commentators of Revelation recognize that “mourning and crying,” the first two words in John’s trio of evils removed from the world in Rev 21:4, can be found in a few places in the Hebrew Scriptures (e.g. Isa 35:10; 55:11), but they are unclear as to why John introduces πόνος into the equation.¹⁹⁴ One possible reason has to do with the LXX version of Isa 65:22–23 in which three important motifs are joined together:¹⁹⁵

1. In a fascinating addition to the Hebrew, the translator of the LXX transforms a reference to the lifespan of a tree into the lifespan of the tree “of life” (τῆς ζωῆς) with the simple addition of two Greek words, effectively changing the imagery to Edenic imagery and conjuring up thoughts of immortality.
2. The translator also altered the final phrase of the verse, which in Hebrew reads, “my chosen shall long enjoy the work of their hands” (בְּחִירִי יִבְלוּ יְדֵיהֶם וּמַעֲשֵׂהָ), but in the LXX is best translated as “they will make obsolete the work of their hard labor (πόνων)” (τὰ ἔργα τῶν πόνων αὐτῶν παλαιώσουσιν; trans. mine).

For the translator and readers of the LXX, hard labor (πόνος) is no longer present in the eschaton—and it is quite possible that John alludes to this passage in Rev 21:4 when he includes πόνος in his list of evils lost in the eschaton.

3. Finally, in Isa 65:23 the LXX once again alters the Hebrew in such a way as to evoke Edenic imagery, this time regarding the curse: “My elect shall not labor in vain nor shall they bear children under the curse (εἰς κατάραν).”¹⁹⁶ By injecting “the curse” into this passage, the LXX creatively ties together laboring and bearing children under the curse, the two curses directed at humanity in Eden (Gen 3:16–17). The total effect of the Septuagintal rendering of Isa 65:22–23 is that the eschatological Jerusalem will be an Edenic paradise in which the tree of life will give life to all of its citizens, hard labor is absent, and the curse is no longer present. All of these are present in Revelation 21–22. In this way, Isa 65:22–23 (LXX) provides the perfect backdrop

¹⁹⁴ So Fekkes, referencing Isa 65:19, writes: “πένθος // בכי and κραυγή // זעקה; πόνος has no parallel and is probably added by John, though still using the verbal framework of Isa. 65” (*Isaiah and Prophetic Tradition*, 256 n. 79; Beale, *Book of Revelation*, 1051). Contra Fekkes, however, the cessation of mourning and crying does not need to be read in concert with any specific passage but makes sense in the large tradition of the absence of mourning and the presence of joy.

¹⁹⁵ Beale recognizes the LXX of Isa 65:22–23 but does not extrapolate its significance (Beale, *The Book of Revelation*, 1245).

¹⁹⁶ Trans. mine.

for reading πόνος in Rev 21:4 as lightened toil and Rev 22:3 as the curse of Genesis 3.

For the GR-minded auditor reading Rev 21:4, the absence of mourning, crying and pain/toil in the eschatological utopia would likely signal the ease of life expected in such a place. A reduced or non-existent workload, an abundance of food, fragrant smells, the absence of war, and any number of *topoi* contribute to the Greco-Roman tradition of reduced anxiety in the eschaton (interestingly, the Jewish tradition does not make such connections). In chapter two, however, the ease of life and lowered anxiety was tied to the specific expectation that one will either not work at all in the Greco-Roman utopia or, if one does work, the work will be light. Thus, on Hesiod's Islands of the Blessed, for example, the few who are privileged to go are said to be "free of care," a fact that is likely linked to the natural fecundity of the land which produces multiple times a year.¹⁹⁷

An example from Pindar is even more apt as a parallel to Rev 21:4. In the *Olympian Odes*, Pindar describes life on the Island of the Blessed as a life "that knows no tears (ἄδακρυον)," a life he immediately contrasts with the life of those who "endure labor (πόνον) that none can look upon" (*Ol.* 2.66–67 [Race, LCL]). The mention of δάκρυον and πόνος would possibly echo in the ears of the GR-minded reader of Revelation where both are mentioned in Rev 21:4. It is almost certain that the GR-minded reader would hear πόνος not as "pain" but as hard work or unbearable labor, as seen in the passage from Pindar.¹⁹⁸ In fact, the ancient mythological god, Πόνος, was the god of hard labor.¹⁹⁹ For the GR-minded reader, then, the removal of πόνος, as defined as hard work, would signal an afterlife in which work is abandoned and ease of life is expected.²⁰⁰

In conclusion, both Jewish- and GR-minded auditors would find the presence of reduced workload in the eschatological utopia. For both auditors, πόνος would likely be heard in this way, and for the Jewish-minded

¹⁹⁷ Hesiod, *Op.* 170–173. Earlier in *Works and Days*, Hesiod does something very similar with regard to the Golden race stating that they were "free from care, entirely apart from toil" (110).

¹⁹⁸ In another example, Hesiod describes the golden race as a free from πόνος (*Op.* 110).

¹⁹⁹ For Πόνος in literature, see Hesiod, *Theog.* 226. In Roman literature he is named "Labor" and appears in Virgil, *Aen.* 6.268; Seneca, *Oed.* 647; Statius, *Theb.* 10.90. N.B. the first word in the trio "mourning, crying, and pain" from Rev 21:4 is πένθος and is also a Greek god (Πένθος), the god of grief and sorrow.

²⁰⁰ An interesting note from BDAG, citing Onesicritus (c. 310 B.C.E.), states that "because of the ὕβρις of humans, Zeus brought the utopian state of affairs in India to an end, and sent πόνος into the life of humans" (852).

reader, the removal of the curse in Rev 22:3 also would have been heard as a removal of the hard work of agriculture and childbearing that characterizes a post-Edenic world. With the removal of the “former things” and the beginning of the “new heaven and the new earth,” John’s eschatological utopia is marked by the absence of extreme toil.

4.3.14. *Divine Presence*

John’s Revelation concludes with a reunion between God and humanity. Heaven and earth are reunited bringing together the divine and the human in a way that only existed in the garden of Eden. The final two chapters of Revelation begin with a chiasm (Rev 21:1–5) in which the central tenet is that “the home of God is among mortals” (Rev 21:3).²⁰¹ Similarly, the vision of the new Jerusalem ends with a description of the throne of God and the Lamb, after which John concludes with the recognition that “they will reign for ever and ever” (22:5). The presence of God and the Lamb and their eternal reign, then, serves as *the* central feature of the new Jerusalem. God’s temple has been moved from the heavens (in chapters 4 and 11) to the new Jerusalem, where there is no longer a temple structure, and there is nothing impeding human-divine interaction—no heaven/earth dichotomy and no temple hierarchy.

Jewish traditions states that, in the eschaton, God was expected to dwell among mortals.²⁰² To the Jewish-minded reader, then, God’s presence in the new Jerusalem would come as no surprise. God was present with Adam and Eve in the garden of Eden. God “tabernacled” with his people, both in the wilderness and eventually in the temple itself. Revelation 21:3 echoes the sentiment of Lev 26:12: “I will walk among you, and will be your God, and you shall be my people.” Or again, this time with regard to the eschatological Israel, Ezek 37:27: “My dwelling-place shall be with them; and I will be their God, and they shall be my people.”²⁰³ In these

²⁰¹ On the chiasm of Rev 21:1–5, see Ruiten, “Intertextual Relationship,” 475–77; Aune, *Revelation 17–22*, 113–14; Fekkes, *Isaiah and Prophetic Tradition*, 258; Mathewson, *A New Heaven and a New Earth*, 33.

²⁰² Isa 12:6; 33:21; 52:8; 64:1–2; 66:1; Ezek 34:11, 30; Joel 2:27; 3:17, 21; Mic 4:1–2, 7; Zech 8:3, 23; Philo, *Gig.* 14; *Cher.* 115; *T. Dan* 5:13; *T. Benj.* 10.11; *L.A.B.* 19.12.

²⁰³ Mathewson (*A New Heaven and a New Earth*, 50–57) prefers Ezekiel as the *Vorbild* of Rev 21:3 while Rissi (*The Future of the World*, 57) and William Dumbrell (*The End of the Beginning*, 79) prefer Leviticus. However, the idea of God dwelling with Israel is so prevalent (Isa 12:6; 33:21; 52:8; 64:1–2; 66:1; Mic 4:1–2, 7; Zech 8:3, 23) as is the covenant formula (Jer 30:22; 31:1, 33; 32:38; Ezek 36:28; 37:23; 43:7, 9; Zech 2:10–11; 8:3, 8) that it is unnecessary to pin down a *Vorbild* to one single passage.

passages, as with Rev 21:3, one finds two elements: a statement of God's presence and the covenant formulation of the relationship between God and the people Israel. God's presence in the eschaton is anticipated by many of the prophets of the Hebrew Scriptures but none more profoundly than Ezekiel, who concludes his prophecy with the renaming of the city of Jerusalem. For eternity it shall be called *שמה יהוה*, "The LORD is there" (Ezek 48:35). God's presence at the new Jerusalem, then, is something the Jewish-minded reader would not only have expected, it is something for which he or she would have longed.

Though the Jewish-minded auditor would have expected an eschaton in which God dwells with humans, the GR-minded auditor would likely have been taken aback. While it is true that the gods of Greco-Roman lore enjoy visiting humans,²⁰⁴ even occasionally taking on human form (Homer, *Od.* 7.199–203), it is rare to find the expectation that humans will live with the gods and commune with them in the eschaton.²⁰⁵ The closest one finds is the goddess Astraea or "Justice" who flees the earth after the Golden Age and the degeneration of humanity.²⁰⁶ The rift that exists between the human and divine, however, is never resolved. In no extant tradition does Astraea return.

God's desire to live with humanity displays the relational nature of Israel's God who throughout Israel's history has made efforts to live among his people, an effort that is finally realized in its fullest sense in the final chapters of Revelation. In this way, Revelation 21–22 might serve as a theological foray into the nature of the God of Christianity and the God of the Hebrew Scriptures. This God is active in the world throughout the book of Revelation culminating in the reunion of heaven and earth when God will again be reunited with humanity and live among them.

4.4. CONCLUSION

The purpose of this chapter was to situate Revelation 21–22 among ancient expectations regarding utopianism, accounting for aspects of place, environment, and the people who inhabit such a place. The fourteen *topoi*

²⁰⁴ For example, the gods particularly enjoy visiting the Ethiopians (Homer, *Il.* 1.424–25) and the Hyperboreans (Diodorus Siculus, 2.47.6; 5.44.5–6; 6.1.6–10), two groups known for their piety.

²⁰⁵ The one exception noted in chapter two was Plato (*Phaedo*, 81A; 111B).

²⁰⁶ Hesiod, *Op.* 256–261; Aratus, *Phaen.* 100–136; Ps.-Eratosthenes, *Catasterismi* 1.244; Hyginus, *Poetica astronomica* 2.25; Ovid, *Metam.* 1.149–150; Ps.-Seneca, *Octavia* 423–425.

represent fourteen common ways in which utopianism is expressed in both Greco-Roman and Jewish literature. As one way of accounting for the diversity that existed within the audience who first received John's Apocalypse in Asia Minor, the perspectives of a Jewish-minded auditor and a GR-minded auditor were considered. In one last effort to synthesize the findings above, the following is, first, a summary of how the Jewish-minded reader would have heard the final two chapters of Revelation, and, second, a similar summary for the GR-minded reader.

Of the fourteen utopian *topoi* distilled from the evidence cited in chapter three, John's Jewish-minded reader would have been able to engage twelve of them to varying degrees and varying levels of directness. The *topoi* of "wine" and "climate" receive no attention as elements of the new Jerusalem's description of utopia. Though the *topos* of wine appears to a large degree in Jewish utopian passages, the *topos* of climate is found sparsely making its absence in the new Jerusalem unsurprising. The *topos* of fragrance is not directly mentioned or even echoed, but those Jewish-minded readers familiar with Edenic traditions about the sweet-smelling nature of the trees of Eden might hear this tradition, along with the healing powers of certain aromas, behind John's statement that the leaves of the tree of life are for the healing of the nations. Another *topos* that is less explicit is any statement about work or reduced work in the new Jerusalem. Nevertheless, for John's Jewish-minded reader, that the "curse" is removed in the eschatological utopia would likely conjure connotations of the curse of Eden, which included the difficulty of working the land, and as this curse is removed, keeping the land will once again become easy, as it was in Eden, a point made by the tree of life's year-long production rate with twelve different kinds of fruit growing on it. Added to this, in a list of evils that will be missing in the new Jerusalem in Rev 21:4, John notes that πόνος will no longer be present, a term that would have been heard as "hard labor," the very kind of labor Josephus mentions in connection with the curse of Adam and Eve.

Of the other *topoi*, John clearly uses them as descriptors of his utopia. His setting includes both rural and urban imagery, an expectation not uncommon in Jewish literature concerning the eschaton. His use of wealth imagery, while at times seemingly in contrast with judgments made earlier in the text, is prevalent in certain strands of Judaism that expected the new Jerusalem to be bedecked in jewels, the afterlife to be a time of great reversal where the poor become rich, and the nations to bring their wealth into the new Jerusalem. John's utopian description, as with Jewish utopianism, includes a river and a spring of life. The tree of

life is present indicating that the *Endzeit* is similar to the *Urzeit*, though the urban imagery mitigates against too close a parallelism. Further, the tree produces bountiful food contributing the idea of utopian abundance. Music is present in the form of the worship of God and the lamb, a common Jewish utopian expectation. The light of the new Jerusalem fits snugly within the Jewish tradition concerning the perpetual presence of light and the glory of God as a light source. Though the presence of peace would have been somewhat veiled, the removal of death, the ever-open gates of the city, and the removal of the “curse”—as understood as the “curse of war”—would have likely signaled that peace will reign in this kingdom. The people of this kingdom will be a righteous people, and as with some strands of Judaism, this people will include the nations, a radical statement that God’s mercy is large and it is wide. Finally, the presence of God would have been heard by the Jewish-minded auditor that once again all is right, the cosmos have been reordered, and the divine-human divide has been done away with.

There is very little in the new Jerusalem that a Jewish-minded auditor—at least one standing within certain traditions of Judaism (and thus be mindful of diversity within the diversity)—would have strained to make sense of, with one provision: the absence of the temple. That John’s new Jerusalem contains no temple is clearly outside the boundaries of all other Jewish utopian visions. This is particularly striking given the ability of the rest of John’s description to resonate so firmly with the Jewish tradition. One must ask why this one element is different. The most likely solution is that John is here not relying on Jewish tradition (or Greco-Roman tradition) but on a newly-founded Christian tradition in which Christ acts as the temple, a tradition clearly present in the fourth gospel and, to a lesser degree, in the other gospels.

Turning to the GR-minded auditor, there are a few ways in which the reading would have shared similarities with the Jewish-minded auditor. For example, similarities would include: surprise over the absence of a temple, the recognition of utopian abundance in the fruit of the tree of life, the expectation of music in the form of worship, the presence of peace would have been assumed (though unlike the Jewish-minded reader, the GR-minded auditor is not likely to pick up on the echo of Zech 14:11 and the “curse of war” in Rev 22:3), and the expectation of righteous citizens of the new Jerusalem. Slight differences, though still compatible, with the Jewish-minded reading would include a great reversal in the after-life regarding wealth, and the idea that the removal of πόνος in the new

Jerusalem would be heard as the removal of “hard toil,” though for the GR-minded reader this may have been understood to be the removal of “*all* toil,” an expectation in some Greco-Roman utopian traditions.

Finally, most interesting are the ways in which a GR-minded auditor would have heard Revelation 21–22 significantly differently from his or her Jewish-minded counterpart. That the new Jerusalem is set in an urban context would indeed have been odd to the GR-minded reader given the Greco-Roman desire for a rural afterlife utopia. Regarding wealth, reading Revelation from a Greco-Roman perspective adds a layer of meaning not found in the Jewish-minded reading, namely, a Greco-Roman utopist would notice that all of the references to wealth in the new Jerusalem are connected to public property, a fact that coheres with Greco-Roman utopian expectations. In this way, the wealth of the new Jerusalem would not have been heard as problematic for some GR-minded auditors because wealth is used properly by being available to all. That John envisions a world without seas would have been heard as a recognition that that which kept people out of utopia—the ocean—is no longer in the way. It would signal that utopia is now open and awaits the flood of “nations” and “kings,” so to speak. In contrast to the Jewish-minded auditor, this auditor would have missed any connections to the tree of life as referencing an Edenic paradise. While the tree of life would have been heard, using the context of Revelation, as producing food for eternal life, any larger connection to the Eden of Genesis or Jewish tradition, such as the tree’s fragrance, would have been lost, even though the GR-minded reader would be listening for a sweet-smelling afterlife which is part of its utopian expectations. The perpetual presence of light would have been disconnected from Jewish tradition, as would God’s light as glorious. Missing from John’s new Jerusalem is any explicit reference to a moderate climate, a widely popular Greco-Roman utopian *topos*. The *topos* is so popular that it may have been assumed by a GR-minded reader, especially in light of passages that hint at agricultural abundance and the ease of life through the removal of πόνος (Rev 21:4). The Jewish tradition of a universal *Völkerwallfahrt* would certainly not be in the cultural repertoire of the GR-minded auditor nor would the debate over whether Gentiles are part of the eschaton. Lastly, the GR-minded reader would likely be most surprised by the intimate presence of the divine in the new Jerusalem. Not only does God dwell there, but he dwells without a temple keeping him separated from humanity. There is very little indication in Greco-Roman literature to suggest that, in the afterlife, gods and humans will

live together. With little doubt, the presence of God's throne in the middle of the city would have been heard as a challenge also to the Roman imperial cult, which says Caesar sits on the throne, and Caesar is god. John's vision of a new cosmos situates the God of the twelve tribes of Israel and the Lamb, whose apostles also number twelve, on the throne. There is no palace or throne for Caesar. Instead, the kings who enter this new Jerusalem will throw their crowns at the foot of the throne (Rev 4:10), recognize Christ as the King of Kings (Rev 17:14; 19:16), and worship God.

CHAPTER FIVE

CONCLUSION

This study set out to accomplish two primary goals: (1) to construct descriptions of ancient Greco-Roman and Jewish utopianism in as detailed a manner as possible in order to (2) read Revelation 21–22 through the lens of utopianism so as to distinguish how a Greco-Roman-minded auditor would have heard this text vis-à-vis a Jewish-minded auditor. When Revelation 21–22 is read in light of ancient utopianism, a number of unique and noteworthy findings present themselves.

In order to accomplish the first of these goals, this study began by distinguishing the various forms in which utopianism is expressed in each of the two cultures, chapter two devoted to Greco-Romanism and chapter three dedicated to ancient Israel and early Judaism. Three categories of utopian expression found in ancient Greco-Roman literature were constructed: (1) political utopianism, (2) primitivistic utopianism, which is comprised of cultural primitivism or chronological primitivism, and (3) afterlife utopianism. For Jewish utopianism, three categories also were constructed: (1) Edenic utopianism, (2) nationalistic utopianism, which is either locative-temporal or legal-covenantal, and (3) eschatological utopianism.

The similarities and differences between the two cultures are significant. Greco-Roman political utopianism finds no true parallel in the Jewish literature. The works of Plato and other Hellenistic philosophers is a directed attempt to create, or at least reflect upon, a perfect society from a top down approach—i.e. through the passing of laws. Though Jewish utopianism contains a legal-covenantal utopian tradition, this tradition is quite limited and primarily includes Sabbath regulation and laws governing the year of Jubilee (hardly Plato's *Republic*!). On the whole, Jewish nationalistic utopianism, as with the other forms of utopianism in both Greco-Romanism and Judaism, is interested in description rather than prescription, despite the few noted exceptions. Philo's description of the Therapeutai and the description of the Essenes in Philo and Josephus, both of which were classified as legal-covenantal utopias, share little in common with the utopianism of Plato and indeed seem to have more in common with the idealistic primitivistic communities.

Greco-Roman chronological primitivistic utopianism, on the other hand, has a considerable affinity with Edenic utopianism in that both conceive of a bygone world in which all was well, and life was good, but is now no longer. Unlike its Greco-Roman counterpart, however, Judaism does not have a form of cultural primitivism that envisages exotic lands, untouched by the corruptive forces of society, that exist as models of the good life.

Finally, both cultures share an interest in the utopian nature of the eschaton. The Greco-Roman utopianism of this stripe was called “afterlife utopianism” rather than eschatological utopianism because, for the Greco-Roman, the eschaton is always related to an individual’s life after death. In Jewish thought, however, much of the Hebrew Scriptures and some early Jewish works like Sirach do not conceive of the eschaton in terms of an individual’s life after death but as the continuation of the nation of Israel and its redemption. For this reason, the label “eschatological utopianism” was given to the Jewish utopia that parallels the “afterlife utopianism” of the Greco-Roman world. In doing so, the slight but significant differences that accompany them were maintained.

In order to construct a detailed description of ancient utopianism, this study next set out to locate common motifs, what were termed *topoi*, that appear repeatedly in utopian accounts in the primary literature. Fourteen such *topoi* were found. Walking through each *topos* individually, the study showed how these *topoi* were utilized by ancient utopists to describe the good life. The *topoi* were not necessarily conceived of as mutually exclusive categories, disconnected from other *topoi*. There was indeed considerable crossover in interests, and some of the *topoi* were found to support others. For example, in a world where difficult work is believed to be absent, the quandary of how one harvests food presents itself. The result is a miraculous agricultural climate in which food grows abundantly and often spontaneously with little or no work. Reduced work and abundant and spontaneous food are part of both cultures’ traditions. The absence of war in the Greco-Roman utopia was attributed to a number of possibilities, most notably, through the primitivistic traditions, the absence of certain technologies (nautical and agricultural) and also the absence of private possessions (including, for some, women and children). In the Jewish tradition, on the other hand, there is some interest in the absence of technologies and concern over wealth leading to war, but peace is overwhelmingly achieved through the presence of God and/or the removal of any military threat. Through a precise explication of the fourteen *topoi*, the reader is able to better grasp the expectations associated with ancient utopias.

After establishing the cultural repertoire concerning ancient utopianism in chapters two and three, chapter four sets Revelation 21–22 in the middle of that context, giving a “thick description” not only of Revelation 21–22 but of the social milieu within which it was read. The methodology employed was an audience-oriented perspective focused on reading Revelation as it might have been heard in its original setting, a setting that includes a culturally diverse audience with both Jew and Gentile. This study demonstrated how a Jewish-minded reader and a Greco-Roman minded reader would hear John’s description of the new Jerusalem with slightly different overtones by placing Revelation 21–22 in contact with the the fourteen *topoi* from the previous two chapters.

Starting with the *topos* “setting” and moving through the fourteen as they appear in chapters two and three, this study argues that John’s Greco-Roman-minded audience would have been surprised by an urban utopia, but at the same time, would likely have made sense of its description through the rhetorical device of *laus urbis*, or the praise of the city. Very few biblical scholars have recognized this element in the new Jerusalem, but the similarities with its description and the rhetorical advice of Quintilian are remarkable. There is certainly room here for further study.

John’s use of wealth imagery in the new Jerusalem fits well with certain Jewish traditions, a fact that has received some attention in the literature. What has not received attention is putting the wealth of Jerusalem in contact with Greco-Roman utopianism, the result of which is that John is not out of bounds with regard to proper use of wealth in utopia. John’s wealth imagery is located entirely in the public sphere—roads, walls, gates—the one exception to the rule against any accumulation of wealth in utopia. Because Greco-Roman utopianism tended toward communism, private wealth was shunned. In this way, John’s new Jerusalem is in keeping with both Jewish and Greco-Roman utopianism.

Perhaps the most surprising feature of Revelation 21–22 is that it has no temple. Only Zeno in the Greco-Roman tradition argued for the removal of temples in his *Republic*, but outside of his influence, the temple played an important role in Jewish and Greco-Roman utopianism. Not only does the new Jerusalem not contain a temple, it is also missing the sea. Again, the unique finding here is related to the Greco-Roman reading in which the sea serves two purposes, especially for primitivistic utopists: for those *seeking* utopia, it kept them at bay always dreaming of what could be; for those *in* utopia, it acted to protect it from the taint of civilization. That the sea is no more in the new heavens and earth, then, would signal that utopia is now open to all—and thus the pilgrimage of nations and kings—and it would signal that there is no longer fear of impurity.

Though the abundance wine, a common *topos* of both cultures, is not explicitly found in the new Jerusalem, the abundance of food is in the form of the tree of life which bears fruit year round. Those Jewish-minded auditors familiar with the traditions of the tree of life would likely have understood its healing powers to be connected to its fragrant aroma. The fragrant nature of Eden and the paradise of God is common in Jewish literature, and it is quite likely this tradition would have seeped into a reading of the tree of life.

Music is present in the new Jerusalem in the form of worship, an idea that would have been common to both cultures. The perpetual presence of light in the new Jerusalem would have been widely expected by those attuned to Jewish traditions, though not as much by the GR-minded reader. And the *topos* of climate, a favorite among Greco-Roman utopists, is entirely absent in the new Jerusalem.

The privation of war and the presence of peace is also a common theme in both cultures. For this reason, it is quite possible that the removal of the “curse” mentioned in Rev 22:3 would have been understood as removal of “the curse of war” in light of the tradition of peace and the affinities this verse shares with Zech 14:11, a passage that also speaks of the removal of war. The “curse,” however, could have an entirely different echo, one related to the Adamic curse suggesting that God’s punishment upon human beings has now been reversed and the ease of life that existed in the garden is once again available to those in the new Jerusalem. This is further supported by Rev 21:4 and John’s mention of the removal of πόνος, often translated “pain” though more often found in the ancient world as meaning “hard labor.” Both Jew and Gentile would have heard the removal of hard labor as a natural part of utopia, though the Jewish-minded auditor would have connected it to the removal of the curse of Adam in Rev 22:3.

The citizens of the new Jerusalem are understood to be righteous, a fact that coheres with both the Jewish-minded and GR-minded expectation of the eschatological utopia. Regarding the inclusion of the Gentiles in the new Jerusalem, John’s mention of the kings and the nations entering into the city fits well with a theological agenda of inclusion, despite his often harsh rhetoric regarding the fate of the nations. The author’s theological agenda fits well with specific passages from the Hebrew Scriptures that suggest the presence of the nations in the eschaton, particularly their pilgrimage to Jerusalem.

Finally, John depicts a new Jerusalem in which God’s throne is the central point of the city. In this way, God’s presence is a key aspect of the

new Jerusalem. The author of Revelation has constructed a world in which the heavens and the earth, i.e. the dwelling places of God and humanity, have been fused. The use of Edenic imagery harkens back to a time when God indeed walked with humanity in the garden. As a large body of Jewish literature also intimates, the Revelation's new Jerusalem is characterized by God's presence, something that would have been odd to the GR-minded reader whose afterlife expectation was primarily limited to human heroes of old.

The overall picture that one gathers from reading Revelation 21–22 in light of both Jewish and Greco-Roman utopianism is that Revelation sits comfortably in a Jewish context while often finding itself out of sorts in a Greco-Roman context. This should come as no surprise, however, given how often the author uses imagery and language from the Hebrew Scriptures, a point borne out by the numerous studies on Revelation's use of Scripture. Nevertheless, since John is writing to churches with Gentile members, one should not too quickly dismiss the possibility that John acknowledged his Greco-Roman audience and occasionally appealed to their sensitivities, perhaps even speaking to both audiences simultaneously. A good rhetorician knows his or her audience and can speak to the diversity within that audience.

AVENUES FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

To continue reading Revelation "at ground level," as Peter Oakes puts it, one might wish to ask how other facets of the societal diversity would alter the reading of Revelation. How would a slave in Smyrna read the text differently than an elite aristocrat in Laodicea? Would an uneducated, female craftworker hear the text differently than a rhetorically trained man? One might wish to set up multiple readers, as does Oakes, in an effort to get a broader feel for the variety of ways this text would have been heard. And before one attempts to make the leap from "what a text meant" to "what a text means," one should stop and press the question, "*to whom?*" By asking what a text meant to various strands of the original audience, one is able to bring to life the history within which the text was born. The variegated nature of the original audience and the variety of contextual lenses they would have brought to the text is an avenue of research that deserves much more attention in biblical research.

As one means of corroborating the methodology adduced here, a study of the reception history of Revelation 21–22 with an eye toward some of

the diverse ways of reading mentioned in this study would be illuminating. If we presuppose that the context of a given reader would influence his or her reading, how does this square with the *Wirkungsgeschichte* of the text over the first few centuries? Are there concrete examples of actual readers—whether in the form of commentaries on Revelation or narratives that clearly echo Revelation—in the first five-hundred or so years of Christianity who read Revelation with a Greco-Roman mindset and, in so doing, read it differently than other contextual readings, namely more Jewish-oriented readings? A study that moves out of the hypothetical reconstruction of a first-century original audience and into the study of actual audiences of a later date would almost certainly be fruit bearing.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

Table A.1. Greco-Roman sources and associated *topoi*.

Source	1. Setting	2. Wealth	3. Temples	4. Rivers/Water	5. Wine	6. Food	7. Fragrance	8. Music	9. Light	10. Climate	11. War/Peace	12. Citizens	13. Work	14. Divine Presence
POLITICAL UTOPIA ¹														
Aristotle, <i>Politica</i>	x	x				x					x	x	x	
Cicero, <i>De legibus</i>	x	x				x					x	x	x	
Cicero, <i>De republica</i>	x	x				x					x	x	x	
Diogenes Laertius, <i>Lives</i> 7.4, 32–34, 121, 129, 131, 187–189		x	x									x		
Philodemus, <i>On the Stoics</i> 2.9–12; 4.14; 5.15; 6.15–17; 7.18–20		x									x	x		
Plato, <i>Laws</i>	x	x				x					x	x	x	

¹ Note that cataloguing the *topoi* of political utopian texts is more difficult than primitivistic and eschatological utopianism for a number of reasons. First, the ancient political utopist typically describes his utopian vision over the course of an entire work, whereas primitivistic and eschatological descriptions are more limited in scope. Second, political utopianism rarely uses visual imagery and metaphors preferring instead a more philosophical description. For this reason, some of the *topoi* chosen simply do not fit the “typical” political description. Nevertheless, political utopists often employ imagery from the other forms of utopian expression in order to make a point (e.g. Plato appeals to myth of the Golden Age as a means of popularizing his message [*Laws* 713B–714B]). For these reasons, when an entire work is in view (rather than a passage from that work), the chart consistently notes that political utopias are generally concerned with six issues from the list of *topoi*: setting (i.e. urban); wealth and communism (often appealing to communistic ways of living); food and the ability of all citizens to have access to food; war and peace; citizens (i.e. the kinds of people allowed in utopia and the kinds of people formed by utopia); and the presence (or absence) of work.

Table A.1. (cont.)

Source	1. Setting	2. Wealth	3. Temples	4. Rivers/Water	5. Wine	6. Food	7. Fragrance	8. Music	9. Light	10. Climate	11. War/Peace	12. Citizens	13. Work	14. Divine Presence
Plato, <i>Politicus</i>	x	x				x					x	x	x	
Plato, <i>Respublica</i>	x	x				x					x	x	x	
Plutarch, <i>Alex. fort.</i> 329ab; <i>Lyc.</i> 3.1–2; <i>Stoic rep.</i> 1034b; 1044b–1045a			x									x		
Porphyry, <i>Abst.</i> 4.3–4	x	x				x								
Sextus Empiricus, <i>Pyr.</i> 1.160; 3.205; 3.246–248		x										x		
PRIMITIVISTIC UTOPIA														
Aelian, <i>Nat. an.</i> 11.1			x					x						
Aeschylus, <i>frag.</i> 196						x						x		
Aratus, <i>Phaen.</i> 96–136						x					x			x
Athenaeus, <i>Deipn.</i> 6.267e–270a		x		x	x	x	x				x	x	x	
Ps.-Callisthenes, <i>Alexander Romance</i> 3.28–29	x	x		x				x	x			x		
Caesar, <i>Bell. gall.</i> 6.21–23	x	x				x					x		x	
Cato, <i>Agr.</i> preface–1.7	x			x	x	x				x				
Diodorus Siculus, 2.47.1–6 (Hecataeus)	x		x	x		x		x		x		x	x	x
Diodorus Siculus, 2.55.1–60.3 (Iambulus)	x			x	x	x			x	x	x	x	x	

Table A.1. (*cont.*)

Source	1. Setting	2. Wealth	3. Temples	4. Rivers/Water	5. Wine	6. Food	7. Fragrance	8. Music	9. Light	10. Climate	11. War/Peace	12. Citizens	13. Work	14. Divine Presence
Diodorus Siculus, 3.68.4–69.4	x			x	x	x	x	x	x					
Diodorus Siculus, 5.19.1–20.4	x			x		x				x		x	x	
Diodorus Siculus, 5.42.1–46.7; 6.1.1–10 (Euhemerus)	x	x	x	x		x	x	x		x		x	x	x
Hesiod, <i>Op.</i> 90–155; 225–247	x					x					x	x	x	
Homer, <i>Od.</i> 5.55–75	x			x	x		x	x						
Homer, <i>Od.</i> 7.37–132, 199–206	x	x		x	x	x				x			x	
Horace, <i>Carm.</i> 2.15	x	x	x				x							
Isidore of Seville, <i>Etymologies</i> 14.6.8	x					x								
Justin, <i>Hist. Phil. epit.</i> 2.2 (Pompeius Trogus)	x	x				x				x	x	x		
Lucian, <i>Saturnalia</i>		x		x	x	x						x	x	
Ovid, <i>Am.</i> 3.8.29–56	x	x				x					x	x		
Ovid, <i>Metam.</i> 1.89–150	x	x		x		x				x	x	x		x
Ovid, <i>Metam.</i> 15.75–110	x	x			x	x	x				x	x	x	
Pindar, <i>Pyth.</i> 10.25–50	x	x						x			x	x	x	
Plato, <i>Laws</i> 713B–714B	x					x					x	x		
Pliny, <i>Nat.</i> 4.12.89–90	x								x	x	x	x		
Plutarch, <i>Sert.</i> 8–9	x						x			x	x		x	
Porphyry, <i>Abst.</i> 4.2	x	x				x					x	x	x	x

Table A.1. (cont.)

Source	1. Setting	2. Wealth	3. Temples	4. Rivers/Water	5. Wine	6. Food	7. Fragrance	8. Music	9. Light	10. Climate	11. War/Peace	12. Citizens	13. Work	14. Divine Presence
Ps.-Seneca, <i>Octavia</i> 377–437	x	x				x					x	x	x	x
Strabo, <i>Geogr.</i> 11.4.1–8	x	x	x	x	x	x				x	x	x		
Tibullus, <i>Elegies</i> 1.3.35–56	x					x					x			
Virgil, <i>Aen.</i> 8.314–336	x	x				x					x			
Virgil, <i>Ecl.</i> 4.1–45	x					x					x	x	x	x
Virgil, <i>Georg.</i> 2.136–194	x	x	x	x	x	x				x	x	x	x	
AFTERLIFE UTOPIA														
Cicero, <i>Resp.</i> 6.9–26 (Dream of Scipio)	x		x					x	x			x		
Hesiod, <i>Op.</i> 156–173	x					x						x	x	
Homer, <i>Od.</i> 4.555–569	x									x			x	x
Horace, <i>Epod.</i> 16.1–66	x					x				x	x	x	x	
Lucian, <i>Ver. hist.</i> 2.4–29	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	
Pindar, <i>Ol.</i> 2.55–80		x		x					x	x		x	x	
Pindar, <i>Dirges frag.</i> 129		x					x		x				x	
Plato, <i>Apol.</i> 40C–41E		x										x		
Plato, <i>Phaed.</i> 110B–111C	x	x				x				x	x			x
Plato, <i>Resp.</i> 363A–E	x				x	x						x	x	

Table A.1. (*cont.*)

Source	1. Setting	2. Wealth	3. Temples	4. Rivers/Water	5. Wine	6. Food	7. Fragrance	8. Music	9. Light	10. Climate	11. War/Peace	12. Citizens	13. Work	14. Divine Presence
Plato, <i>Resp.</i> 614A–621D	x	x		x				x	x			x		
Propertius, <i>Elegies</i> 4.7.60–76	x			x			x	x		x		x		
Strabo, <i>Geogr.</i> 1.1.4–6	x	x								x				
Strabo, <i>Geogr.</i> 3.2.13–14	x	x								x			x	
Tibullus, <i>Elegies</i> 1.3.57–66	x					x	x	x						
Virgil, <i>Aen.</i> 6.636–751	x			x			x	x	x			x	x	

APPENDIX B

Table B.1. Jewish sources and revelation and associated *topoi*.

Source	1. Setting	2. Wealth	3. Temples	4. Rivers/Water	5. Wine	6. Food	7. Fragrance	8. Music	9. Light	10. Climate	11. War/Peace	12. Citizens	13. Work	14. Divine Presence
EDENIC UTOPIA														
Gen 2:4–3:24	x	x		x		x						x	x	x
Ezek 28:11–19	x	x									x	x		x
<i>Apoc. Ab.</i> 21.6–23.14	x			x		x	x					x	x	
<i>2 Bar.</i> 4.1–6; 51.11	x													
Ps.-Philo, <i>L.A.B.</i> 19.10–13; 25.11–26.15; 32.8	x	x					x		x					x
<i>1 En.</i> 32	x					x	x							
<i>1 En.</i> 60.8, 23; 61.1–13; 70.3–4	x											x		
<i>2 En.</i> 8.1–9.1	x			x	x	x	x	x				x		x
<i>2 En.</i> 31.1–8	x							x	x					x
<i>2 En.</i> 42.3–14	x							x				x		x
<i>4 Ezra</i> 4.7; 7.36, 123; 8.52	x					x						x	x	
<i>Jub.</i> 3.8–35	x		x			x					x	x	x	x
<i>Jub.</i> 4.23–30	x		x									x		
<i>Jub.</i> 8.19–30	x		x	x						x				
<i>G.L.A.E.</i> 28.1–29.6	x					x	x					x		
<i>T. Dan</i> 5.9–13	x	x									x			x
<i>T. Lev.</i> 18.1–14; esp. v. 10	x					x			x		x	x		

Table B.1. (*cont.*)

Source	1. Setting	2. Wealth	3. Temples	4. Rivers/Water	5. Wine	6. Food	7. Fragrance	8. Music	9. Light	10. Climate	11. War/Peace	12. Citizens	13. Work	14. Divine Presence
<i>T. Ab.</i> [A] 20.14	x										x	x	x	
Josephus, <i>Ant.</i> 1.37–51	x	x		x		x							x	x
Philo, <i>Leg.</i> 1, 2, 3 (esp. 1.45–46)				x					x		x	x		x
Philo, <i>Opif.</i> 167–172						x							x	
Philo, <i>Plant.</i> 32–40						x			x			x		x
Philo, <i>QG</i> 1.1–57				x		x			x	x		x	x	
NATIONALISTIC UTOPIA														
Exod 23:20–33	x					x					x	x		x
Lev 25:1–26:13	x	x			x	x					x	x	x	x
Deut 8:1–20	x	x		x	x	x							x	
Deut 11:8–25	x				x	x							x	
1 Kings 5:1–8:66	x	x	x			x		x			x	x		x
2 Chron 3:4–7:22	x	x	x			x					x	x		x
Ezek 40–48	x		x	x		x			x			x		x
2 Bar. 4.1–6	x													
1 En. 26–27	x			x								x		
<i>Let. Aris.</i> 51–120	x	x	x	x	x	x					x	x	x	
<i>Pss. Sol.</i> 11.1–9	x		x				x					x		
<i>Pss. Sol.</i> 17.21–46	x	x	x								x	x		
<i>Sib. Or.</i> 5.238–85	x	x		x		x		x	x		x	x		
Josephus, <i>Ant.</i> 8.1–129	x	x	x			x	x	x				x		x

Table B.1. (*cont.*)

Source	1. Setting	2. Wealth	3. Temples	4. Rivers/Water	5. Wine	6. Food	7. Fragrance	8. Music	9. Light	10. Climate	11. War/Peace	12. Citizens	13. Work	14. Divine Presence
Josephus, <i>Ant.</i> 18.18–22		x	x									x	x	
Josephus, <i>J.W.</i> 2.119–161	x	x				x					x	x		
Josephus, <i>J.W.</i> 5.136–247	x	x	x									x		
Philo, <i>Contempl.</i> 1–90	x	x	x		x	x		x	x	x		x	x	x
Philo, <i>Hypoth.</i> 11.1–18		x				x				x		x	x	
Philo, <i>Praem.</i> 79–126		x				x					x	x		
Philo, <i>Prob.</i> 75–91	x	x	x			x					x	x	x	
Pliny, <i>Nat.</i> 5.17.4	x	x										x		
ESCHATOLOGICAL UTOPIA														
Isa 2:2–4	x										x	x		
Isa 25:1–27:13	x	x			x	x		x		x	x	x		
Isa 33:15–22	x			x		x						x		
Isa 35:1–10	x			x				x			x	x		
Isa 60:1–62:12	x	x	x		x	x			x		x	x	x	
Isa 65:17–66:20	x		x	x							x	x	x	x
Jer 30:1–31:40	x				x	x		x			x			x
Ezek 34:11–31	x					x					x	x		x
Ezek 36:8–38	x					x						x	x	
Ezek 40–48	x		x	x		x			x			x		x
Hos 14:1–9					x					x				

Table B.1. (*cont.*)

Source	1. Setting	2. Wealth	3. Temples	4. Rivers/Water	5. Wine	6. Food	7. Fragrance	8. Music	9. Light	10. Climate	11. War/Peace	12. Citizens	13. Work	14. Divine Presence
Joel 2:19–29; 3:16–21	x		x	x	x	x	x				x	x		x
Amos 9:11–15	x				x	x						x	x	
Mic 4:1–5:15	x		x		x	x					x	x		x
Zech 8:1–23	x				x						x	x		x
Zech 14:1–21	x	x	x	x					x	x	x	x		
Bar 4:30–5:9	x						x		x	x	x	x		
<i>Apoc. Ab.</i> 21.1–23.14	x			x		x			x			x	x	
<i>Apoc. Zeph.</i> 2.6–7									x			x		
<i>Apoc. Zeph.</i> 8.1–12.8	x	x		x					x			x		
<i>2 Bar.</i> 4.1–6	x		x									x		
<i>2 Bar.</i> 29.1–30.5					x	x	x							
<i>2 Bar.</i> 48.48–51.16	x								x			x		
<i>2 Bar.</i> 73.1–74.4						x					x	x	x	
Ps.-Philo, <i>L.A.B.</i> 19.10–13; 25.11–26.15; 32.8	x	x					x		x					x
<i>1 En.</i> 10.16–22					x	x					x	x		
<i>1 En.</i> 24–27	x			x		x	x					x		
<i>1 En.</i> 52.1–9		x									x			
<i>1 En.</i> 58.1–6									x		x		x	
<i>1 En.</i> 62.13–16						x						x		
<i>1 En.</i> 102.4–103.4		x				x			x					x
<i>1 En.</i> 103.9–104.6	x								x					
<i>2 En.</i> 8.1–9.1	x			x	x	x	x	x				x		x

Table B.1. (*cont.*)

Source	1. Setting	2. Wealth	3. Temples	4. Rivers/Water	5. Wine	6. Food	7. Fragrance	8. Music	9. Light	10. Climate	11. War/Peace	12. Citizens	13. Work	14. Divine Presence
2 <i>En.</i> 42.3–14	x							x				x		x
4 <i>Ezra</i> 4.7; 7.36, 123; 8.52	x					x						x	x	
<i>Jub.</i> 1.29	x		x						x		x			
<i>Jub.</i> 4.26	x													
<i>Jub.</i> 23.22–31											x	x		
<i>Odes Sol.</i> 11.1–24				x	x	x	x		x			x	x	x
<i>Pss. Sol.</i> 17.21–46	x	x	x								x	x		
<i>Sib. Or.</i> 2.313–38	x	x		x	x	x			x			x	x	
<i>Sib. Or.</i> 3.702–95	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x		x	x		
<i>Sib. Or.</i> 4.179–92	x								x			x		
<i>Sib. Or.</i> 5.414–433	x	x	x					x	x		x			
<i>T. Benj.</i> 10.6–9												x		x
<i>T. Dan</i> 5.9–13	x	x									x			x
<i>T. Jud.</i> 25.1–5	x	x										x		
<i>T. Lev.</i> 18.1–14	x					x			x		x	x		
<i>T. Ab.</i> [A] 20.14	x										x	x	x	
Josephus, <i>J.W.</i> 2.154–158	x			x						x		x		
Philo, <i>Praem.</i> 165–172		x							x		x			
REVELATION 21–22	x	x	x	x		x	x	x	x		x	x	x	x

BIBLIOGRAPHY

PRIMARY LITERATURE

- 1 *Enoch*. Translated by G. W. E. Nickelsburg and J. C. VanderKam. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2004.
- The Apostolic Fathers*. Translated by B. Ehrman. 2 vols. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2003.
- Aratus. *Phaenomena*. Translated by D. Kidd. Cambridge Classical Texts and Commentaries 34. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.
- Aristotle. *Politics*. Translated by H. Rackham. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1932.
- Caesar. *The Gallic War*. Translated by H. J. Edwards. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1917.
- Charlesworth, James H., ed. *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*. 2 vols. The Anchor Bible Reference Library. New York: Doublday, 1983.
- Diodorus Siculus. *Library of History*. Translated by C. H. Oldfather et al. 12 vols. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1933–1967.
- Diogenes Laertius. *Lives of Eminent Philosophers*. Translated by R. D. Hicks. 2 vols. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1925.
- García Martínez, Florentino, and Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, eds. *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition*. 2 vols. Leiden: Brill; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997–1998.
- Herodotus. *The Persian Wars*. Translated by A. D. Godley. 4 vols. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1920–1925.
- Hesiod. *Works and Days*. Translated by G. W. Most. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2007.
- Homer. *Odyssey*. Translated by A. T. Murray. 2 vols. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1919.
- Horace. *The Complete Odes and Epodes*. Translated by David West. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.
- Isidore of Seville. *The Etymologies of Isidore of Seville*. Translated by S. A. Barney, W. J. Lewis, J. A. Beach, O. Berghof. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.
- Josephus. Translated by H. St. J. Thackeray et al. 10 vols. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1926–1965.
- Justin. *Epitome of the Philippic History of Pompeius Trogus*. Translated by J. S. Watson. London: Henry G. Bohn, 1853.
- Lucian. Translated by A. M. Harmon et al. 8 vols. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1913–1967.
- Lucretius. *On the Nature of Things*. Translated by W. H. D. Rouse. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1924.
- Ovid. Translated by G. Showerman et al. 6 vols. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1914–1931.
- Pausanias. *Description of Greece*. Translated by W. H. S. Jones et al. 5 vols. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1918–1935.
- Philo. Translated by F. H. Colson et al. 12 vols. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1929–1962.
- Pindar. Translated by W. H. Race. 2 vols. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1997.
- Plato. Translated by H. N. Fowler et al. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1914–1935.

- Plutarch. *Lives*. Translated by B. Perrin. 11 vols. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1914–1926.
- Polybius. *The Histories*. Translated by W. R. Paton. Revised by F. W. Walbank et al. 6 vols. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1927–2012.
- Pomponius Mela. *Description of the World*. Translated by F. E. Romer. Ann Arbor, Mich.: University of Michigan Press, 1998.
- Porphyry. *On Abstinence from Killing Animals*. Translated by G. Clark. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 2000.
- Quintillian. *The Orator's Education*. Translated by D. A. Russell. 5 vols. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2002.
- Schneemelcher, Wilhelm, ed. *New Testament Apocrypha*. Translation edited by R. McL. Wilson. 2 vols. Revised edition. Cambridge: James Clarke & Co., 1991–1992.
- Seneca. Translated by T. H. Corcoran et al. 10 vols. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1913–2004.
- Sextus Empiricus. Translated by R. G. Bury. 4 vols. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1933–1949.
- Strabo. *Geography*. Translated by H. L. Jones. 8 vols. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1917–1932.
- Tacitus. *Agricola, Germania, and Dialogue on Oratory*. Translated by M. Hutton and W. Peterson. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1914.
- Tibullus. *Elegies*. Translated by G. Lee. Leeds: Francis Cairns, 1990.
- Varro. *On Agriculture*. Translated by W. D. Hooper and H. B. Ash. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1934.
- Virgil. *Eclogues, Georgics, and Aeneid*. Translated by H. R. Fairclough. 2 vols. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1916–1918.

SECONDARY LITERATURE

- Abma, Richtsje. "Travelling from Babylon to Zion: Location and its Function in Isaiah 49–55." *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 74 (1997): 3–28.
- Aitken, Ellen Bradshaw. "The Landscape of Promise in the Apocalypse of Paul." Pages 153–65 in *Walk in the Ways of Wisdom: Essays in Honor of Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza*. Edited by S. Matthews, C. Kittredge, and M. J. Debaufre. Harrisburg, Penn.: Trinity Press International, 2003.
- Albinus, Lars. *The House of Hades: Studies in Ancient Greek Eschatology*. Studies in Religion 2. Aarhus: Aarhus University Press, 2000.
- Alexander, Desmond. "The Old Testament View of Life After Death." *Themelios* 11.2 (1986): 41–46.
- Amit, Yairah. "Biblical Utopianism: A Mapmakers Guide to Eden." *Union Seminary Quarterly Review* 44 (1990): 11–17.
- Anderson, Gary A. "The Cosmic Mountain: Eden and its Early Interpreters in Syriac Christianity." Pages 187–224 in *Genesis 1–3 in the History of Exegesis: Intrigue in the Garden*. Studies in Women and Religion 27. Edited by Gregory Allen Robbins. Lewiston: Edwin Mellen Press, 1988.
- . *The Genesis of Perfection: Adam and Eve in Jewish and Christian Imagination*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2001.
- Anderson, Gary A. and Michael E. Stone, eds. *A Synopsis of the Books of Adam and Eve*. Second Revised Edition. Early Judaism and Its Literature 17. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1999.
- Anderson, Gary A., Michael E. Stone, and Johannes Tromp, eds. *Literature on Adam and Eve: Collected Essays*. Leiden: Brill, 2000.
- Arnold, Bill T. "Old Testament Eschatology and the Rise of Apocalypticism." Pages 23–39 in *The Oxford Handbook of Eschatology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.
- Aune, David E. *Revelation 1–5*. Word Biblical Commentary 52a. Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 1997.

- . *Revelation 6–16*. Word Biblical Commentary 52b. Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 1998.
- . *Revelation 17–22*. Word Biblical Commentary 52c. Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 1998.
- Aune, David E., with Eric Stewart. "From the Idealized Past to the Imaginary Future: Eschatological Restoration in Jewish Apocalyptic Literature." Pages 13–38 in *Apocalypticism, Prophecy and Magic in Early Christianity: Collected Essays*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 199. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006.
- Avery-Peck, Alan J., and Jacob Neusner, eds. *Death, Life-after-Death, Resurrection and the World-to-Come in the Judaisms of Antiquity*. Vol. 4 of *Judaism in Late Antiquity*. Leiden: Brill, 2000.
- Bachman, Veronika. "Rooted in Paradise? The Meaning of the 'Tree of Life' in 1 Enoch 24–25 Reconsidered." *Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha* 19 (2009): 83–107.
- Bailey, Lloyd R., Sr. *Biblical Perspectives on Death*. Overtures to Biblical Theology. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1979.
- Balch, David L. "Two Apologetic Encomia: Dionysius on Rome and Josephus on the Jews." *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 13 (1982): 102–22.
- Baldry, H. C. *Ancient Utopias*. Southampton, England: University of Southampton, 1956.
- . "Who Invented the Golden Age?" *Classical Quarterly*, New Series 2 (1952): 83–92.
- . "Zeno's Ideal State." *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 79 (1959): 3–15.
- Barr, David L. "The Reader of/in the Apocalypse: Exploring a Method." *Eastern Great Lakes and Midwest Biblical Society Proceedings* 10 (1990): 79–89.
- Barr, James. *The Garden of Eden and the Hope of Immortality*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1993.
- Barth, Christoph. *Die Errettung vom Tode in den individuellen Klage- und Dankliedern des Alten Testaments*. Zollikon: Evangelischer Verlag, 1947.
- Bauckham, Richard. *The Climax of Prophecy: Studies on the Book of Revelation*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1993.
- . *The Fate of the Dead: Studies on the Jewish and Christian Apocalypses*. Supplements to Novum Testamentum 93. Leiden: Brill, 1998.
- . "Life, Death, and the Afterlife in Second Temple Judaism." Pages 80–95 in *Life in the Face of Death: The Resurrection Message of the New Testament*. Edited by R. Longenecker. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998.
- . "Paradise in the Biblical Antiquities of Pseudo-Philo." Pages 43–56 in *Paradise in Antiquity: Jewish and Christian Views*. Edited by Markus Bockmuehl and Guy G. Stroumsa. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010.
- . *The Theology of the Book of Revelation*. New Testament Theology. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.
- Baumgarten, Joseph M. "4Q500 and the Ancient Conception of the Lord's Vineyard." *Journal of Jewish Studies* 40 (1989): 1–6.
- Bautch, Kelley Coblenz. "Situating the Afterlife." Pages 249–64 in *Paradise Now: Essays on Early Jewish and Christian Mysticism*. Edited by April D. DeConick. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2006.
- . *A Study of the Geography of 1 Enoch 17–19: "No One Has Seen What I Have Seen."* Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism 81. Leiden: Brill, 2003.
- Beale, G. K. *The Book of Revelation: A Commentary on the Greek Text*. The New International Greek Testament Commentary. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999.
- . "Eden, the Temple, and the Church's Mission in the New Creation." *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 48 (2005): 5–31.
- . "A Response to Jon Paulien on the Use of the Old Testament in Revelation." *Andrews University Seminary Studies* 39 (2001): 23–33.
- . *The Temple and the Church's Mission: A Biblical Theology of the Dwelling Place of God*. New Studies in Biblical Theology. Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity Press, 2004.
- . *The Use of Daniel in Jewish Apocalyptic Literature and in the Revelation of St. John*. Lanham, Md.: University Press of America, 1984.

- Beavis, Mary Ann. *Jesus & Utopia: Looking for the Kingdom of God in the Roman World*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2006.
- . "The Kingdom of God, 'Utopia' and Theocracy." *Journal for the Study of the Historical Jesus* 2 (2004): 91–106.
- . "Philo's Therapeutai: Philosopher's Dream or Utopian Construction?" *Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha* 14 (2004): 30–42.
- Beckwith, Ibsen T. *The Apocalypse of John*. New York: Macmillan, 1919.
- Ben Zvi, Ehud, ed. *Utopia and Dystopia in Prophetic Literature*. Publications of the Finnish Exegetical Society 92. Helsinki: Finnish Exegetical Society; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2006.
- Berges, Ulrich, and Rudolph Hoppe. *Arm und Reich*. Neue Echter Bibel 10. Würzburg: Echter, 2009.
- Bernabé, Alberto and Ana Isabel Jiménez San Cristóbal. *Instructions for the Netherworld: The Orphic Gold Tablets*. Religions in the Graeco-Roman World. Translated by Michael Chase. Leiden: Brill, 2007.
- Bernheim, Pierre-Antoine, and Guy Stavridès. *Paradis, Paradis*. Paris: Noësis, 1999.
- Bernstein, Alan E. *The Formation of Hell: Death and Retribution in the Ancient and Early Christian Worlds*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1993.
- Bichler, Reinhold. *Von der Insel der Seligen zu Platons Staat: Gischichte der antiken Utopie I*. Alltag und Kultur im Altertum 3. Vienna: Böhlau, 1995.
- Biddle, Mark Edward. "The Figure of Lady Jerusalem: Identification, Deification and Personification of Cities in the Ancient Near East." Pages 173–94 in *The Biblical Canon in Comparative Perspective*. Edited by L. Younger, W. Hallo, and B. Batto. Scripture in Context 4. New York: Mellen Press, 1991.
- Bietenhard, Hans. *Die himmlische Welt im Urchristentum und Spätjudentum*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 2. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1951.
- Black, Matthew. "The Account of the Essenes in Hippolytus and Josephus." Pages 172–75 in *The Background of the New Testament and its Eschatology: In Honor of Charles Harold Dodd*. Edited by W. D. Davies and D. Daube. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1956.
- Blomberg, Craig L. *Neither Poverty nor Riches: A Biblical Theology of Material Possessions*. New Studies in Biblical Theology 7. Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity Press, 1999.
- Blount, Brian K. *Revelation: A Commentary*. New Testament Library. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2009.
- Boccaccini, Gabriele. *Beyond the Essene Hypothesis: The Parting of the Ways between Qumran and Enochic Judaism*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998.
- . *Middle Judaism: Jewish Thought, 300 B.C.E. to 200 C.E.* Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1991.
- Bockmuehl, Markus. "Locating Paradise." Pages 192–209 in *Paradise in Antiquity: Jewish and Christian Views*. Edited by Markus Bockmuehl and Guy G. Stroumsa. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010.
- Bockmuehl, Markus, and Guy G. Stroumsa, eds. *Paradise in Antiquity: Jewish and Christian Views*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010.
- Bousset, Wilhelm. *Die Offenbarung Johannes*. Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament 16. 6th ed. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1906.
- Boxall, Ian. *The Revelation of St. John*. Black's New Testament Commentaries 18. London: Continuum, 2006.
- Bremmer, Jan N. *The Early Greek Concept of the Soul*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1983.
- . "Paradise: From Persia, via Greece, into the Septuagint." Pages 1–20 in *Paradise Interpreted: Representations of Biblical Paradise in Judaism and Christianity*. Edited by G. Luttikhuisen. Themes in Biblical Narrative 2. Leiden: Brill, 1999.
- . "Rationalization and Disenchantment in Ancient Greece: Max Weber among the Pythagoreans and Orphics?" Pages 71–83 in *From Myth to Reason: Studies in the Development of Greek Thought*. Edited by R. Buxton. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999.

- . *The Rise and Fall of the Afterlife*. London: Routledge, 2002.
- Bridgman, Timothy P. *Hyperboreans: Myth and History in Celtic-Hellenic Contacts*. Studies in Classics. New York: Routledge, 2005.
- Briggs, Robert A. *Jewish Temple Imagery in the Book of Revelation*. Studies in Biblical Literature 10. New York: Peter Lang, 1999.
- Brooke, George. "Miqdash Adam, Eden, and the Qumran Community." Pages 285–301 in *Gemeinde ohne Tempel—Community without Temple: Zur Substituierung und Transformation des Jerusalemer Tempels und seines Kults im Alten Testament, antiken Judentum und frühen Christentum*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 118. Edited by B. Ego, A. Lange, and P. Pilhofer. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1999.
- Broshi, Magen. "Wine in Ancient Palestine: Introductory Notes." Pages 144–73 in *Bread, Wine, Walls and Scrolls*. Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha: Supplement Series 36. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 2001.
- Brueggemann, Walter. *Genesis*. Interpretation. Atlanta: John Knox, 1982.
- Buchanan, George Wesley. *The Book of Revelation*. Lewiston, NY.: Edwin Mellen, 1993.
- Budde, Karl Ferdinand R. *Die biblische Urgeschichte, Gen. 1–12, 5, untersucht*. Giessen: J. Ricker'sche Buchhandlung, 1883.
- Carlsson, Leif. *Round Trips to Heaven: Other Worldly Travelers in Early Judaism and Christianity*. Lund Studies in History of Religions 19. Stockholm: Almqvist and Wiksell International, 2004.
- . "The Dream of a New Jerusalem at Qumran." Pages 231–54 in *The Scrolls and Christian Origins*. Edited by James H. Charlesworth. Vol. 3 of *The Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls*. The Princeton Symposium on the Dead Sea Scrolls. Waco: Baylor Press, 2006.
- Carroll-Spillecke, Maureen. "Griechische Garten." Pages 153–75 in *Der Garten von der Antike bis zum Mittelalter*. Kulturgeschichte der antiken Welt 57. Edited by M. Carroll-Spillecke. Mainz: Philipp von Zabern, 1992.
- . *Kepos: Der antike griechische Garten*. Munich: Deutscher Kunstverlag, 1989.
- Cavallin, Hans C. "Leben nach dem Tode in Spätjudentum und in frühen Christentum." *ANRW* 19.1:240–345. Part 2, *Principat*, 19.1. Edited by W. Haase. New York: de Gruyter, 1979.
- . *Life after Death: Paul's Argument for the Resurrection of the Dead in 1 Cor 15: Part I: An Enquiry in to the Jewish Background*. Lund: Gleerup, 1974.
- Charles, R. H. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Revelation of St. John*. 2 vols. The International Critical Commentary. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1920.
- Chatman, Seymour. *Story and Discourse, Narrative Structure in Fiction and Film*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1978.
- Chazon, Esther Glickler. "The Creation and Fall of Adam in the Dead Sea Scrolls." Pages 13–24 in *The Book of Genesis in Jewish and Oriental Christian Interpretation: A Collection of Essays*. Edited by J. Frishman and L. Van Rompay. *Traditio Exegetica Graeca* 5. Louven: Peeters, 1997.
- Chyutin, Michael. *Architecture and Utopia in the Temple Era*. Library of Second Temple Studies 58. London: T&T Clark, 2006.
- . "The New Jerusalem: Ideal City." *DSD* 1 (1994): 71–97.
- Clark-Solés, Jaime. *Death and the Afterlife in the New Testament*. New York: T&T Clark, 2006.
- Clay, Diskin, and Andrea Purvis. *Four Island Utopias*. The Focus Classical Library. Newburyport, Mass.: Focus Publishing, 1999.
- Clifford, Richard J. *The Cosmic Mountain in Canaan and the Old Testament*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1972.
- Collins, Adela Yarbro. *The Combat Myth in the Book of Revelation*. Harvard Dissertations in Religion 9. Missoula: Scholars Press, 1976.
- . *Cosmology and Eschatology in Jewish and Christian Apocalypticism*. Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism 50. Leiden: Brill, 1996.
- . "The Seven Heavens in Jewish and Christian Apocalypses." Pages 59–93 in *Death, Ecstasy, and Other Worldly Journeys*. Edited by J. Collins and M. Fishbane. Albany, N.Y.: SUNY Press, 1995.

- Collins, John J. "The Afterlife in Apocalyptic Literature." Pages 119–39 in *Judaism in Late Antiquity, Part 4: Death, Life-after Death, Resurrection and the World-to-Come in the Judaisms of Antiquity*. Edited by A. J. Avery-Peck and J. Neusner. Leiden: Brill, 2000.
- . *The Apocalyptic Imagination: An Introduction to Jewish Apocalyptic Literature*. Second Edition. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998.
- . "Apocalyptic Eschatology as the Transcendence of Death." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 36 (1974): 21–43.
- . "Apocalyptic Eschatology in the Ancient World." Pages 40–55 in *The Oxford Handbook of Eschatology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.
- . *Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls*. New York: Routledge, 1997.
- . *Jerusalem and the Temple in Jewish Apocalyptic Literature of the Second Temple Period*. International Rennert Guest Lecture Series 1. Ramat-Gan, Israel: Bar-Ilan University Press, 1998.
- . "Models of Utopia in the Biblical Tradition." Pages 51–67 in *"A Wise and Discerning Mind": Essays in Honor of Burke O. Long*. Brown Judaic Studies 325. Edited by S. M. Olyan and R. C. Culley. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2000.
- . "Prophecy, Apocalypse and Eschatology: Reflections on the Proposals of Lester Grabbe." Pages 44–52 in *Knowing the End from the Beginning: The Prophetic, the Apocalyptic and Their Relationships*. Edited by L. Grabbe and R. Haak. Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha: Supplement Series 46. New York: T&T Clark, 2003.
- Collins, John J. and Michael Fishbane, eds. *Death, Ecstasy, and Other Worldly Journeys*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1995.
- Collins, Marilyn F. "The Hidden Vessels in Samaritan Traditions." *Journal for the Study of Judaism in the Persian, Hellenistic, and Roman Periods* 3 (1972): 97–116.
- Coloe, Mary. *God Dwells with Us: Temple Symbolism in the Fourth Gospel*. Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 2001.
- Cook, Stephen. "Funerary Practices and Afterlife Expectations in Ancient Israel." *Religion Compass* 1 (2007): 660–83.
- Copeland, Kirsti B. "Sinners and Post-Mortem 'Baptism' in the Acherusian Lake." Pages 91–107 in *The Apocalypse of Peter*. Edited by J. Bremmer and I. Czachesz. Leuven: Peeters Publishers, 2003.
- Cornelius, Izak. "Paradise Motifs in the 'Eschatology' of the Minor Prophets and the Iconography of the Ancient Near East: The Concepts of Fertility, Water, Trees, and 'Tierfrieden' and Gen. 2–3." *Journal of Northwest Semitic Languages* 14 (1988): 41–83.
- Cothenet, Edouard. "Earthly and Heavenly Liturgy According to the Book of Revelation." Pages 115–35 in *Roles in the Liturgical Assembly*. Translated by M. J. O'Connell. New York: Pueblo, 1981.
- Cross, Frank Moore, Jr. *The Ancient Library of Qumran*. 3d ed. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995.
- Cullmann, Oscar. "Immortality of the Soul or Resurrection of the Dead?" Pages 9–35 in *Immortality and Resurrection*. Edited by K. Stendahl. New York: MacMillan, 1971.
- Darr, Kathryn Pfisterer. "The Wall around Paradise: Ezekielian Ideas about the Future." *Vetus Testamentum* 37 (1987): 271–79.
- Daschke, Dereck. *City of Ruins: Mourning the Destruction of Jerusalem through Jewish Apocalypse*. Biblical Interpretation Series 99. Leiden: Brill, 2010.
- Davies, Philip R. "Death, Resurrection, and Life after Death in the Qumran Scrolls." Pages 189–211 in *Judaism in Late Antiquity, Part 4: Death, Life-after Death, Resurrection and the World-to-Come in the Judaisms of Antiquity*. Edited by A. J. Avery-Peck and J. Neusner. Leiden: Brill, 2000.
- . "From Zion to Zion: Jerusalem in the Dead Sea Scrolls." Pages 164–70 in *Jerusalem in Ancient History and Tradition*. Edited by T. Thompson. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament: Supplement Series 381. London: T & T Clark, 2003.
- Dawson, Doyné. *Cities of the Gods: Communist Utopias in Greek Thought*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1992.

- De Jonge, Marinus. *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: A Study of their Text, Composition and Origin*. 2d ed. Van Gorcum's theologische bibliotheek 25. Assen: Van Gorcum, 1975.
- De Young, James Calvin. *Jerusalem in the New Testament: The Significance of the City in the History of Redemption and in Eschatology*. Kampen: J. H. Kok, 1960.
- Dean-Otting, Mary. *Heavenly Journeys: A Study of the Motif in Hellenistic Jewish Literature*. Judentum und Umwelt 8. New York: Peter Lang, 1984.
- Delebecque, É. "Où situer l' arbre de vie dans la Jérusalem celeste? Note sur Apocalypse 22, 2." *Revue Thomiste* 88 (1988): 124–30.
- Delling, Gerhard. "Zum Gottesdienstlichen Stil der Johannesapokalypse," *Novum Testamentum* 3 (1959): 107–37.
- Delumeau, Jean. *History of Paradise: The Garden of Eden in Myth & Tradition*. Translated by Matthew O'Connell. Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 2000.
- Derrett, J. Duncan M. "Whatever Happened to the Land Flowing with Milk and Honey?" *Vigiliae Christianae* 38 (1984): 178–84.
- Dershowitz, Idan. "A Land Flowing with Fat and Honey." *Vetus Testamentum* 60 (2010): 172–76.
- Dim, Emmanuel Uchenna. *The Eschatological Implications of Isa 65 and 66 as the Conclusion of the Book of Isaiah*. Bible in History 3. Bern: Peter Lang, 2005.
- . "History and Apocalyptic Eschatology: A Reply to J. Y. Jindo." *Novum Testamentum* 51 (2006): 413–18.
- Dodds, E. R. *The Greeks and the Irrational*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1951.
- Dombrowski, Daniel A. *The Philosophy of Vegetarianism*. Amherst, Mass.: University of Massachusetts Press, 1984.
- Donaldson, Terence L. "Proselytes or 'Righteous Gentiles'? The Status of Gentiles in Eschatological Pilgrimage Patterns of Thought." *Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha* 7 (1990): 3–27.
- Dougherty, James. *The Fivesquare City: The City in the Religious Imagination*. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1980.
- Dover, Kenneth James. *Greek Popular Morality in the Time of Plato and Aristotle*. Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing Company, 1974.
- Dow, Lois K. Fuller. *Images of Zion: Biblical Antecedents for the New Jerusalem*. New Testament Monographs 26. Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2010.
- Dumbrell, William J. *The End of the Beginning: Revelation 21–22 and the Old Testament*. Homebush West, NSW: Lancer Books, 1985.
- Eichrodt, Walther. *Theology of the Old Testament*. 2 vols. The Old Testament Library. Translated by J. A. Baker. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1961–1967.
- Ellingson, Ter. *The Myth of the Noble Savage*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2001.
- Engberg-Pederson, Troels. "Philo's *De Vita Contemplativa* as a Philosopher's Dream." *Journal for the Study of Judaism in the Persian, Hellenistic and Roman Period* 30 (1999): 40–64.
- Essbaum, Jill. *Heaven*. Hanover, N.H.: University Press of New England, 2000.
- Evans, Rhiannon. *Utopia Antiqua: Readings of the Golden Age and Decline at Rome*. Routledge Monographs in Classical Studies. London: Routledge, 2008.
- Evyasaf, Rona-Shani. "Hellenistic and Roman Approaches to Gardens in the Eastern Mediterranean: Judaea as a Case Study." Pages 203–204 in *The Archaeology of Crop Fields and Gardens: Proceedings of the 1st Conference on Crop Fields and Gardens Archaeology. Barcelona (Spain), 1–3 June 2006*. Edited by J.-P. Morel et al. Bari: Edipuglia, 2006.
- Fairey, Emily. "Slavery in the Classical Utopia: A Comparative Study." Ph.D. diss., The City University of New York, 2006.
- Farrer, Austin. *The Revelation of St. John the Divine*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1964.
- Fekkes, Jan III. *Isaiah and Prophetic Traditions in the Book of Revelation: Visionary Antecedents and their Developments*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series 93. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1994.

- . "His Bride Has Prepared Herself": Revelation 19–21 and Isaian Nuptial Imagery." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 109 (1990): 269–87.
- Ferguson, John. *The Religions of the Roman Empire*. Surrey: Thames & Hudson, 1970.
- . *Utopias of the Classical World*. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1975.
- Festa, Nicola. *I Frammenti degli Stoici Antichi*. Bari: Guiseppe Laterza e Figli, 1935.
- Fiddes, Paul S. *The Promised End: Eschatology in Theology and Literature*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 2000.
- Finley, Moses I. "Utopianism Ancient and Modern." Pages 3–20 in *The Critical Spirit: Essays in Honor of Herbert Marcuse*. Edited by K. H. Wolff and B. Moore. Boston: Beacon Press, 1967.
- Fischer, Ulrich. *Eschatologie und Jenseitserwartung im hellenistischen Diasporajudentum*. Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche 44. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1978.
- Friedman, Richard Elliott, and Shawna Dolansky Overton. "Death and Afterlife: The Biblical Silence." Pages 35–59 in *Judaism in Late Antiquity, Part 4: Death, Life-after Death, Resurrection and the World-to-Come in the Judaisms of Antiquity*. Edited by A. J. Avery-Peck and J. Neusner. Leiden: Brill, 2000.
- Fuks, Alexander. "Τοῖς ἀποροῦμένοις κοινωνεῖν: The Sharing of Property by the Rich with the Poor in Theory and Practice." Pages 172–89 in *Social Conflict in Ancient Greece*. Jerusalem: The Magnes Press, 1984.
- Gaines, Elizabeth Ann. "The Eschatological Jerusalem: The Function of the Image in the Literature of the Biblical Period." Ph.D. diss., Princeton Theological Seminary, 1988.
- Galambush, Julie. *Jerusalem in the Book of Ezekiel: The City as Yahweh's Wife*. Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series 130. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992.
- García Martínez, Florentino. "Interpretation of the Flood in the Dead Sea Scrolls." Pages 86–108 in *Interpretations of the Flood*. Edited by F. García Martínez, and G. Luttikhuisen. Themes in Biblical Narrative 1. Leiden: Brill, 1998.
- . "Man and Woman: Halakhah Based upon Eden in the Dead Sea Scrolls." Pages 95–115 in *Paradise Interpreted: Representations of Biblical Paradise in Judaism and Christianity*. Edited by Gerard Luttikhuisen. Themes in Biblical Narrative 2. Leiden: Brill, 1999.
- . "The Origin of Evil and the Dualistic Thought of the Sect." Pages 162–192 in *Encyclopedia of Apocalypticism*. Edited by J. J. Collins. Vol. I of *Encyclopedia of Apocalypticism: The Origins of Apocalypticism in Judaism and Christianity*. Edited by J. J. Collins. New York: Continuum, 2000.
- Garland, Robert. *The Greek Way of Death*. 2d ed. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2001.
- Gaster, Moses. "Hebrew Visions of Hell and Paradise." *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland* 25 (1893): 571–611.
- Georgi, Dieter. "John's 'Heavenly' Jerusalem." Pages 161–86 in *The City in the Valley: Biblical Interpretation and Urban Theology*. Studies in Biblical Literature 7. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2005. Translation of "Die Visionen vom himmlischen Jerusalem in Apk 21 und 22." Pages 351–72 in *Kirche: Festschrift für Günther Bornkamm zum 75. Geburtstag*. Edited by D. Lührman and G. Strecker. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1980.
- Georgiadou, Aristoula and David H. J. Larmour. "Lucian and Historiography: 'De Historia Conscribenda' and 'Verae Historiae.'" *ANRW* 34.2:1448–1509. Part 2, *Principat*, 34.2. Edited by W. Haase and H. Temporini. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1994.
- . *Lucian's Science Fiction Novel True Histories: Interpretation and Commentary*. Leiden: Brill, 1998.
- Giamatti, A. Bartlett. *The Earthly Paradise and the Renaissance Epic*. Ontario: Penguin Books, 1966. Repr., New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1989.
- Giesecke, Annette Lucia. "Beyond the Garden of Epicurus: The Utopics of the Ideal Roman Villa." *Utopian Studies* 12 (2001): 13–32.
- . "Homer's Eutopolis: Epic Journeys and the Search for an Ideal Society." *Utopian Studies* 14 (2003): 23–40.
- . "Lucretius and Virgil's Pastoral Dream." *Utopian Studies* 10 (1999): 1–15.

- Ginzberg, Louis. *The Legends of the Jews*. 7 vols. Translated by H. Szold and P. Radin. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America, 1909–1938.
- Goldingay, John. "Death and Afterlife in the Psalms." Pages 61–86 in *Judaism in Late Antiquity, Part 4: Death, Life-after Death, Resurrection and the World-to-Come in the Judaisms of Antiquity*. Edited by A. J. Avery-Peck and J. Neusner. Leiden: Brill, 2000.
- Goodman, Martin. "Paradise, Gardens, and the Afterlife in the First Century CE." Pages 57–63 in *Paradise in Antiquity: Jewish and Christian Views*. Edited by Markus Bockmuehl and Guy G. Stroumsa. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010.
- Goulder, Michael D. "The Apocalypse as an Annual Cycle of Prophecies." *New Testament Studies* 27 (1981): 342–67.
- Gowan, Donald E. *Eschatology in the Old Testament*. 2d ed. London: T&T Clark, 2000.
- Grabbe, Lester L. "Eschatology in Philo and Josephus." Pages 163–85 in *Judaism in Late Antiquity, Part 4: Death, Life-after Death, Resurrection and the World-to-Come in the Judaisms of Antiquity*. Edited by A. J. Avery-Peck and J. Neusner. Leiden: Brill, 2000.
- . "Introduction and Overview." Pages 2–43 in *Knowing the End from the Beginning: The Prophetic, the Apocalyptic and Their Relationships*. Edited by L. L. Grabbe and R. D. Haak. Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha: Supplement Series 46. New York: T&T Clark, 2003.
- . "Prophetic and Apocalyptic: Time for New Definitions—and New Thinking." Pages 107–33 in *Knowing the End from the Beginning: The Prophetic, the Apocalyptic and Their Relationships*. Edited by L. L. Grabbe and R. D. Haak. Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha: Supplement Series 46. New York: T&T Clark, 2003.
- Grabbe, Lester L. and Robert D. Haak, eds. *Knowing the End from the Beginning: The Prophetic, the Apocalyptic and Their Relationships*. Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha: Supplement Series 46. New York: T&T Clark, 2003.
- Graf, Fritz, and Sarah Iles Johnston. *Ritual Texts for the Afterlife: Orpheus and the Bacchic Gold Tablets*. New York: Routledge, 2007.
- Grappe, Christian, ed. *Le Repas de Dieu / Das Mahl Gottes*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 169. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004.
- Green, William Scott. "Ancient Judaism, Contours and Complexity." Pages 293–310 in *Language, Theology, and the Bible: Essays in Honour of James Barr*. Edited by S. E. Balentine and J. Barton. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994.
- Grelot, Pierre. "La géographie mythique d'Hénoch et ses sources orientales." *Revue biblique* 65 (1958): 33–69.
- Gross, Heinrich. *Die Idee des Ewigen und Allgemeinen Weltfriedens im Alten Orient und im Alten Testament*. Trier: Paulinus Verlag, 1956.
- Gundry, Robert H. "The New Jerusalem People as Place, Not Place for People." *Novum Testamentum* 3 (1987): 254–64.
- Guthrie, W. K. *Orpheus and Greek Religion: A Study in the Orphic Movement*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1952.
- Hadas, Moses. *Aristeas to Philocrates (Letter of Aristeas)*. New York: Harper, 1951.
- Hallote, Rachel S. *Death, Burial, and Afterlife in the Biblical World: How the Israelites and Their Neighbors Treated the Dead*. Chicago: Ivan R. Dee, 2001.
- Hanson, Paul D. *The Dawn of Apocalyptic: The Historical and Sociological Roots of Jewish Apocalyptic Eschatology*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1975.
- Harrington, Wilfred J. "Positive Eschaton Only: Revelation and Universal Salvation." *Proceedings of the Irish Biblical Association* 15 (1992): 42–59.
- . *Revelation*. Sacra Pagina 16. Collegeville, Minn.: Liturgical Press, 1993.
- Harris, Michael A. "The Literary Function of Hymns in the Apocalypse of John." Ph.D. diss., Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1989.
- Haussleiter, Johannes. *Der Vegetarismus in der Antike*. Religionsgeschichtliche Versuche und Vorarbeiten 24. Berlin: Alfred Topelmann, 1935.
- Hay, David M. "Foins for the Therapeutae: References to Other Texts and Persons in Philo's *De Vita Contemplativa*." Pages 330–48 in *Neotestamentica et Philonica*. Edited by D. Aune, T. Seland, and J. H. Ulrichsen. Leiden: Brill, 2003.

- . "Things Philo Said and Did Not Say about the Therapeutae." Pages 673–83 in *SBL Seminar Papers, 1992*. Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Papers 31. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992.
- Hayward, C. T. Robert. "The Figure of Adam in Pseudo-Philo's Biblical Antiquities." *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 23 (1992): 1–20.
- . *The Jewish Temple: A Non-Biblical Sourcebook*. London: Routledge, 1996.
- Heide, Gale Z. "What Is New about the New Heaven and the New Earth? A Theology of Creation from Revelation 21 and 2 Peter 3." *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 40 (1997): 37–56.
- Heinberg, Richard. *Memories and Visions of Paradise: Exploring the Universal Myth of a Lost Golden Age*. Los Angeles: Jeremy P. Tarcher, Inc., 1989.
- Hengel, Martin. *Property and Riches in the Early Church*. Translated by John Bowden. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1974.
- Herfort-Koch, Marlene. *Tod, Totenfürsorge und Jenseitsvorstellungen in der griechischen Antike. Eine Bibliographie*. Quellen und Forschungen zur Antiken Welt 9. München: Tuduv, 1992.
- Hertzler, Joyce Oramel. *The History of Utopian Thought*. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1923.
- Hess, Richard S., and Gordon J. Wenham, eds. *Zion, City of Our God*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999.
- Hill, Charles E. *Regnum Caelorum: Patterns of Millennial Thought in Early Christianity*. 2d ed. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2001.
- Himmelfarb, Martha. *Ascent to Heaven in Jewish and Christian Apocalypses*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1993.
- . "The Temple and the Garden of Eden in Ezekiel, the Book of the Watchers, and the Wisdom of ben Sira." Pages 63–78 in *Sacred Places and Profane Spaces: Essays in the Geographics of Judaism, Christianity, and Islam*. Edited by Jamie Scott and Paul Simpson-Housley. New York: Greenwood Press, 1991.
- . *Tours of Hell: An Apocalyptic Form in Early Jewish and Christian Literature*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1988.
- Holtz, Gudrun. "Inclusivism at Qumran." *Dead Sea Discoveries* 16 (2009): 22–54.
- Holtz, Traugott. *Die Christologie der Apokalypse des Johannes*. Texte und Untersuchungen 85. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1962.
- Hoppe, Leslie J. *The Holy City: Jerusalem in the Theology of the Old Testament*. Collegeville, Minn.: Liturgical Press, 2000.
- . *There Shall Be No Poor Among You: Poverty in the Bible*. Nashville: Abingdon Press 2004.
- Iser, Wolfgang. *The Implied Reader: Patterns in Communication in Prose Fiction from Bunyan to Beckett*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1974.
- Jacobson, Howard. *A Commentary on Pseudo-Philo's Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum, with Latin Text and English Translation*. Arbeiten zur Geschichte des antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums 31. 2 vols. Leiden: Brill, 1996.
- Jauhainen, Marko. *The Use of Zechariah in Revelation*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 2:199. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005.
- Jenni, Ernst. "Eschatology of the OT." Pages 126–33 in vol. 2 of *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*. Edited by G. A. Buttrick. 4 vols. Nashville: Abingdon, 1962.
- Jeremias, Joachim. *Jesus' Promise to the Nations*. London: SCM Press, 1958.
- Jindo, Job Y. "On Myth and History in Prophetic and Apocalyptic Eschatology." *Vetus Testamentum* 55 (2005): 412–15.
- Jobling, David. "'Forced Labor': Solomon's Golden Age and the Question of Literary Representation." *Semeia* 54 (1991): 57–76.
- Johnston, Philip S. "Afterlife." Pages 5–8 in *Dictionary of the Old Testament: Wisdom, Poetry, and Writings*. Edited by T. Longman III and P. Enns. Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity Press, 2008.

- . *Shades of Sheol: Death and Afterlife in the Old Testament*. Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity, 2002.
- Jörns, Klaus-Peter. *Das hymnische Evangelium: Untersuchungen zu Aufbau, Funktion und Herkunft der hymnischen Stücke in der Johannesoffenbarung*. Studien zum Neuen Testament 5. Gütersloher: Gerd Mohn, 1971.
- Karp, Andrew. "The Need for Boundaries: Homer's Critique of the Phaeacian Utopia in the *Odyssey*." *Utopian Studies* 6 (1995): 25–34.
- Kim, Jung Hoon. *The Significance of Clothing Imagery in the Pauline Corpus*. London: T&T Clark, 2004.
- Kistemaker, Simon J. "The Temple in the Apocalypse." *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 43 (2000): 433–41.
- Klauck, Hans-Josef. "Gütergemeinschaft in der klassischen Antike, in Qumran und in Neuen Testament." *Revue de Qumran* 11 (1982): 47–79.
- Knight, W. F. Jackson, with G. Wilson Knight. *Elysion: On Ancient Greek and Roman Beliefs Concerning a Life after Death*. New York: Barnes & Noble, 1970.
- Koester, Craig R. "The Distant Triumph Song: Music and the Book of Revelation." *Word and World* 12 (1992): 243–49.
- Kowalski, Beate. *Die Rezeption des Propheten Ezechiel in der Offenbarung des Johannes*. Stuttgarter biblische Beiträge 52. Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 2004.
- Kuhn, Heinz-Wolfgang. "The Impact of Selected Qumran Texts on the Understanding of Pauline Theology." Pages 153–85 in *The Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by J. Charlesworth. The Second Princeton Symposium on Judaism and Christian Origins. Vol. 3 of *The Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Waco: Baylor Press, 2006.
- Kugel, James L. *Traditions of the Bible: A Guide to the Bible As It Was at the Start of the Common Era*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1998.
- Labahn, Michael. "Ausharren im Leben, um vom Baum des Lebens zu essen und ewig zu leben: zur Textform und Auslegung der Paradiesgeschichte der Genesis in der Apokalypse des Johannes und deren Textgeschichte." Pages 291–316 in *Florilegium Lovaniense: Studies in Septuagint and Textual Criticism in Honour of Florentino García Martínez*. Edited by H. Ausloos, B. Lemmelijn, and M. Vervenne. Leuven: Peeters, 2008.
- Lambden, Stephen N. "From Fig Leaves to Fingernails: Some Notes on the Garments of Adam and Eve in the Hebrew Bible and Select Early Postbiblical Jewish Writings." Pages 74–90 in *A Walk in the Garden: Biblical, Iconographical, and Literary Images of Eden*. Edited by P. Morris and D. Sawyer. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 136. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1992.
- Lanfer, Peter T. "Allusion to and Expansion of the Tree of Life and Garden of Eden in Biblical and Pseudepigraphal Literature." Pages 96–108 in *Early Christian Literature and Intertextuality*. Vol. 1. Edited by C. Evans and H. D. Zacharias. London: T&T Clark, 2009.
- Latacz, Joachim. "Zeus' Reise zu den Äthiopen." Pages 53–80 in *Gnomosyne: Menschliches Denken und Handeln in der frühgriechischen Literatur: Festschrift für Walter Marg zum 70 Geburtstag*. Edited by G. Kurz, D. Müller, W. Nicolai. Munich: Beck 1981.
- Lattke, Michael. *Odes of Solomon: A Commentary*. Edited by Harold W. Attridge. Translated by Marianne Ehrhardt. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2009.
- Lebram, Jürgen C. H. "Der Idealstaat der Juden." Pages 233–53 in *Josephus—Studien: Untersuchungen zu Josephus, dem antiken Judentum und dem Neuen Testament: Otto Michel zum 70. Geburtstag gewidmet*. Edited by O. Betz, K. Haacker, and M. Hengel. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1974.
- Lecoq, Danielle, and Roland Schaer. "Ancient, Biblical, and Medieval Traditions." Pages 35–82 in *Utopia: The Search for the Ideal Society in the Western World*. Edited by R. Schaer, G. Claeys, and L. T. Sargent. New York: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- Lee, Pilchan. *The New Jerusalem in the Book of Revelation: A Study of Revelation 21–22 in the Light of its Background in Jewish Tradition*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 2:229. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004.

- Leppäkari, Maria. *Apocalyptic Representations of Jerusalem*. Studies in the History of Religions (Supplement to *Numen*) 3. Leiden: Brill, 2006.
- Lesky, Albin. "Okeanos." Pages 58–87 in *Thalatta: Der Weg der Griechen zum Meer*. Vienna: Rohrer, 1947.
- Levenson, Jon D. *Resurrection and the Restoration of Israel: The Ultimate Victory of the God of Life*. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 2006.
- . *The Theology of the Program of Restoration of Ezekiel 40–48*. Harvard Semitic Monograph Series 10. Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1976.
- Levine, Etan. "The Land of Milk and Honey." *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 87 (2000): 43–57.
- Levine, Lee I. *Jerusalem: Portrait of the City in the Second Temple Period (538 BCE–70 CE)*. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 2002.
- Levitas, Ruth. *The Concept of Utopia*. Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1991.
- Lichtenberger, Hermann. "Die Mahlmetaphorik in der Johannesapokalypse." Pages 227–52 in *Le Repas de Dieu / Das Mahl Gottes*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 169. Edited by C. Grappe. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004.
- Lincoln, Andrew T. *Paradise Now and Not Yet: Studies in the Role of the Heavenly Dimension of Paul's Thought with Special Reference to his Eschatology*. Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series 43. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981.
- Longenecker, Bruce W. *Remember the Poor: Paul, Poverty, and the Greco-Roman World*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010.
- Longenecker, Bruce W., and Kelly D. Liebengood, eds.. *Engaging Economics: New Testament Scenarios and Early Christian Reception*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009.
- Lovejoy, Arthur O. and George Boas. *Primitivism and Related Ideas in Antiquity*. Vol. 1 of *A Documentary History of Primitivism and Related Ideas*. Edited by A. O. Lovejoy, G. Chinard, G. Boas, and R. S. Crane. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1935.
- Lupieri, Edmondo F. *A Commentary on the Apocalypse of John*. Translated by M. Johnson and A. Kamesar. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006. Translation of *L'Apocalisse di Giovanni*. Milan: Fondazione Lorenzo Valla, 1999.
- Luttkhuizen, Gerard P., ed. *Paradise Interpreted: Representations of Biblical Paradise in Judaism and Christianity*. Themes in Biblical Narrative 2. Leiden: Brill, 1999.
- Luz, Ehud. "Utopia and Return: On the Structure of Utopian Thinking and Its Relation to Jewish-Christian Tradition." *Journal of Religion* 73 (1993): 357–77.
- Macaskill, Grant. "Paradise in the New Testament." Pages 64–81 in *Paradise in Antiquity: Jewish and Christian Views*. Edited by Markus Bockmuehl and Guy G. Stroumsa. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010.
- MacMullen, Ramsay. *Paganism in the Roman Empire*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1981.
- Malina, Bruce J. and John J. Pilch. *Social-Science Commentary on the Book of Revelation*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2000.
- Manuel, Frank E. and Fritz P. Manuel. *Utopian Thought in the Western World*. Cambridge, Mass.: The Belknap Press, 1979.
- Martin-Achard, Robert. *From Death to Life: A Study of the Development of the Doctrine of the Resurrection in the Old Testament*. Edinburgh: Oliver & Boyd, 1960.
- Mathews, Mark Dewayne. "Riches, Poverty, and the Faithful: Perspectives on Wealth in the Second Temple Period and the Apocalypse of John." Ph.D. diss., Durham University, 2010.
- Mathewson, David. "Assessing Old Testament Allusions in the Book of Revelation." *Evangelical Quarterly* 75 (2003): 311–25.
- . "The Destination of the Nations in Revelation 21:1–22:5: A Reconsideration." *Tyndale Bulletin* 53 (2002): 121–42.
- . "New Exodus as a Background for 'The Sea Was No More' in Revelation 21:1C." *Trinity Journal* 24 (2003): 243–58.

- . *A New Heaven and a New Earth: The Meaning and Function of the Old Testament in Revelation 21.1–22.5*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series 238. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2003.
- McClung, William Alexander. *The Architecture of Paradise: Survivals of Eden and Jerusalem*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1983.
- McConnell, James R., Jr. "The Topos of Divine Testimony in Luke-Acts." Ph.D. diss., Baylor University, 2009.
- McDannell, Colleen and Bernhard Lang. *Heaven: A History*. 2d ed. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 2001.
- McGregor, Gaile. *The Noble Savage and the New World Garden: Notes Towards a Syntactics of Place*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1988.
- McKelvey, R. J. *The New Temple: the Church in the New Testament*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1969.
- McNicol, Allan J. *The Conversion of the Nations*. Library of New Testament Studies 438. New York: T&T Clark, 2011.
- Mealand, David L. "Community of Goods and Utopian Allusions in Acts II–IV." *Journal of Theological Studies* (1977): 96–99.
- Menahem, Kister. "The Tree of Life and the Turning Sword: Jewish Biblical Interpretation, Symbols, and Theological Patterns and Their Christian Counterparts." Pages 138–55 in *Paradise in Antiquity: Jewish and Christian Views*. Edited by M. Bockmuehl and G. Stroumsa. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010.
- Mendels, Doron. "Hellenistic Utopia and the Essenes." *Harvard Theological Review* 72 (1979): 207–22.
- Metzger, Martin. "Himmliches Jerusalem und Tempelarchitektur. Ein Beitrag zum Verständnis von Apokalypse 21, 16f." Pages 39–74 in *Schöpfung, Thron und Heiligtum. Beiträge zur Theologie des Alten Testaments*. Edited by M. Metzger and W. Zwickel. Biblisch-theologische Studien 57. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 2003.
- Meyers, Carol L. and Eric M. Meyers. "Jerusalem and Zion after the Exile: The Evidence of First Zechariah." Pages 121–35 in *"Sha'arei Talmon": Studies in the Bible, Qumran and the Ancient Near East Presented to Shemaryahu Talmon*. Edited by M. Fishbane and E. Tov. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 1992.
- Mikalsen, Jon D. *Honor Thy Gods: Popular Religion in Greek Tragedy*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1994.
- Millard, Alan R. "The Etymology of Eden." *Vetus Testamentum* 34 (1984): 103–105.
- Miller, James E. *The Western Paradise: Greek and Hebrew Traditions*. San Francisco: International Scholars Publications, 1996.
- Minear, Paul S. "The Cosmology of the Apocalypse." Pages 23–37 in *Current Issues in the New Testament Interpretation: Essays in Honor of O. A. Piper*. Edited by W. Klassen and G. F. Snyder. New York: Harper and Row, 1962.
- Moo, Jonathan. "The Sea that is No More: Rev 21:1 and the Function of Sea Imagery in the Apocalypse of John." *Novum Testamentum* 51 (2009): 148–167.
- Moore, Clifford Herschel. *Pagan Ideas of Immortality during the Early Roman Empire*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1918.
- Moore, George F. *Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era: The Age of the Tannaim*. 3 Vols. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1927–30.
- Mounce, Robert H. *The Book of Revelation*. The New International Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1977.
- Moyise, Steve. "Authorial Intention and the Book of Revelation." *Andrews University Seminary Studies* 39 (2001): 35–40.
- . "Does the Author of Revelation Misappropriate the Scriptures?" *Andrews University Seminary Studies* 40 (2002): 3–21.
- . "Intertextuality and the Use of Scripture in the Book of Revelation?" *Scriptura* 84 (2003): 391–401.

- . "The Language of the Old Testament in the Apocalypse." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 76 (1999): 97–113.
- . *The Old Testament in the Book of Revelation*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995.
- Mumford, Lewis. *The Story of Utopias*. New York: The Viking Press, 1962.
- Murphy, Frederick J. *The Structure and Meaning of Second Baruch*. Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series 78. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1985.
- Murphy, Roland E. "Death and Afterlife in the Wisdom Literature." Pages 101–16 in *Judaism in Late Antiquity, Part 4: Death, Life-after Death, Resurrection and the World-to-Come in the Judaisms of Antiquity*. Edited by A. J. Avery-Peck and J. Neusner. Leiden: Brill, 2000.
- Neusner, Jacob. "Introduction: The Four Approaches to the Description of Ancient Judaism(s): Nominalist, Harmonistic, Theological, and Historical." Pages 1–32 in *Judaism in Late Antiquity, Part 4: Death, Life-after Death, Resurrection and the World-to-Come in the Judaisms of Antiquity*. Edited by A. J. Avery-Peck and J. Neusner. Leiden: Brill, 2000.
- . "Qumran and Jerusalem: Two Jewish Roads to Utopia." *Journal of Bible and Religion* 27 (1959): 284–90.
- . *Rabbinic Utopia*. Studies in Judaism. Lanham, Md.: University Press of America, 2007.
- Newsom, Carol. "4Q378 and 4Q379: An Apocryphon of Joshua." Pages 35–85 in *Qumranstudien: Vorträge und Beiträge der Teilnehmer des Qumranseminars auf dem internationalen Treffen der Society of Biblical Literature, Münster, 25.–26. Juli 1993*. Schriften des Institutum Judaicum Delitzschianum 4. Edited by H. J. Fabry, A. Lange, H. Lichtenberger. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1996.
- Nickelsburg, George W. E. *1 Enoch 1: A Commentary on the Book of 1 Enoch, Chapters 1–36; 81–108*. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2001.
- . "Judgment, Life-After-Death, and Resurrection in the Apocrypha and Non-Apocalyptic Pseudepigrapha." Pages 141–62 in *Judaism in Late Antiquity, Part 4: Death, Life-after Death, Resurrection and the World-to-Come in the Judaisms of Antiquity*. Edited by A. J. Avery-Peck and J. Neusner. Leiden: Brill, 2000.
- . *Resurrection, Immortality, and Eternal Life in Intertestamental Judaism and Early Christianity*. Expanded ed. Harvard Theological Studies 56. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2006.
- . "Riches, the Rich, and God's Judgment in 1 Enoch 92–105 and the Gospel according to Luke." *New Testament Studies* 25 (1979): 324–44.
- . "Where is the Place of Eschatological Blessing?" Pages 53–72 in *Things Revealed: Studies in Early Jewish and Christian Literature in Honor of Michael E. Stone*. Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism 89. Edited by E. Chazon, D. Satran, and R. Clements. Leiden: Brill, 2004.
- Nickelsburg, George W. E., and James C. VanderKam. *1 Enoch 2: A Commentary on the Book of 1 Enoch, Chapters 37–82*. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2012.
- Niehoff, Maren R. "Philo's Scholarly Inquiries into the Story of Paradise." Pages 28–42 in *Paradise in Antiquity: Jewish and Christian Views*. Edited by Markus Bockmuehl and Guy G. Stroumsa. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010.
- . "Questions and Answers in Philo and Genesis Rabbah." *Journal for the Study of Judaism in the Persian, Hellenistic and Roman Period* 39 (2008): 337–66.
- Nir, Rivka. "The Aromatic Fragrances of Paradise in the Greek Life of Adam and Eve and the Christian Origin of the Composition." *Novum Testamentum* 46 (2004): 20–45.
- Noort, Ed. "Gan-Eden in the Context of the Mythology of the Hebrew Bible." Pages 21–36 in *Paradise Interpreted: Representations of Biblical Paradise in Judaism and Christianity*. Edited by Gerard Luttikhuisen. Themes in Biblical Narrative 2. Leiden: Brill, 1999.
- Novakovic, Lidija. "4Q521: The Works of the Messiah or the Signs of the Messianic Time?" Pages 208–31 in *Qumran Studies: New Approaches, New Questions*. Edited by M. T. Davis and B. A. Strawn. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007.
- O'Rourke, John J. "The Hymns of the Apocalypse." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 30 (1968): 399–409.

- Oakes, Peter. "Jason and Penelope Hear Philippians 1.1–11." Pages 155–64 in *Understanding, Studying and Reading: New Testament Essays in Honour of John Ashton*. Edited by C. Rowland and C. H. T. Fletcher-Louis. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998.
- . *Reading Romans in Pompeii: Paul's Letter at Ground Level*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2009.
- Olson, Daniel C. "'Those Who Have Not Defiled Themselves with Women': Revelation 14:4 and the Book of Enoch." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 59 (1997): 492–510.
- Orlov, Andrei A. *The Enoch-Metatron Tradition*. Texts and Studies in Ancient Judaism 107. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005.
- Osborne, Grant R. *Revelation*. Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2002.
- Osborne, Robin. "Classical Greek Gardens: Between Farm and Paradise." Pages 373–91 in *Garden History: Issues, Approaches, Methods*. Edited by J. Dixon. Washington: Dumbarton Oaks, 1992.
- Osiek, Carolyn. "House Churches and the Demographics of Diversity." *Religious Studies Review* 27 (2001): 228–31.
- Otzen, Benedikt. "Heavenly Visions in Early Judaism: Origin and Function." Pages 199–215 in *In the Shelter of Elyon*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament: Supplement Series 28. Edited by D. Clines and P. Davies. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1984.
- . "The Paradise Trees in Jewish Apocalyptic." Pages 140–54 in *Apocryphon Severini: Presented to Søren Giversen*. Edited by P. Bilde, H. K. Nielsen, J. Podemann Sørensen. Aarhus, Denmark: Aarhus University Press, 1993.
- Park, Joseph S. *Conceptions of Afterlife in Jewish Inscriptions: With Special Reference to Pauline Literature*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000.
- Parsons, Mikeal C. *Body and Character in Luke and Acts: The Subversion of Physiognomy in Early Christianity*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2006.
- . *Luke: Storyteller, Interpreter, Evangelist*. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 2007.
- Patmore, Hector M. "Adam or Satan? The Identity of the King of Tyre in Late Antiquity." Pages 59–69 in *After Ezekiel: Essays on the Reception of a Difficult Prophet*. Edited by P. M. Joyce and A. Mein. London: T&T Clark, 2011.
- Paulien, Jon. "Dreading the Whirlwind: Intertextuality and the Use of the Old Testament in Revelation." *Andrews University Seminary Studies* 39 (2001): 5–22.
- Pervo, Richard I. "Panta Koina: The Feeding Stories in the Light of Economic Data and Social Practice." Pages 163–94 in *Religious Propaganda and Missionary Competition in the New Testament World: Essays Honoring Dieter Georgi*. Edited by L. Bormann, K. Del Tredici, A. Standhartinger. Novum Testamentum Supplements 74. Leiden: Brill, 1994.
- Petersen, David L. "Eschatology (OT)." Pages 575–79 in vol. 2 of *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*. Edited by D. N. Freedman. 6 vols. New York: Doubleday, 1992.
- Pilgrim, Walter E. "Universalism in the Apocalypse." *Word and World* 9 (1983): 235–43.
- Poorthuis, Marcel, and Chana Safrai, eds. *The Centrality of Jerusalem: Historical Perspectives*. Kampen, Netherlands: Kok Pharos, 1996.
- Priest, John F. "A Note on the Messianic Banquet." Pages 222–38 in *The Messiah*. Edited by J. Charlesworth. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992.
- Prigent, Pierre. *Apocalypse et Liturgie*. Cahiers Théologiques 52. Neuchâtel: Editions Delachaux et Niestlé, 1964.
- . *Commentary on the Apocalypse of St. John*. Translated by W. Pradels. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2001.
- Psaki, Regina and Charles Hindley. *The Earthly Paradise: The Garden of Eden from Antiquity to Modernity*. Binghamton: Global Publications, 2002.
- Purcell, Nicholas. "Town in Country and Country in Town." Pages 186–203 in *Ancient Roman Villa Gardens*. Edited by E. B. MacDougall. Washington: Dumbarton Oaks, 1987.
- Rabinowitz, Peter J. "Truth in Fiction: A Reexamination of Audiences." *Critical Inquiry* 4 (1977): 121–41.

- . "Whirl without End: Audience Oriented Criticism." Pages 81–100 in *Contemporary Literary Theory*. Edited by G. D. Atkins and L. Morrow. Amherst: University of Minnesota Press, 1989.
- Raphael, Simcha Paull. *Jewish Views of the Afterlife*. Northvale, N.J.: J. Aronson, 1994.
- Räpple, Eva Maria. *The Metaphor of the City in the Apocalypse of John*. Studies in Biblical Literature 67. New York: Peter Lang, 2004.
- Reader, W. W. "The Twelve Jewels of Revelation 21:19–20: Tradition History and Modern Interpretation." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 100 (1981): 433–57.
- Reddish, Mitchell G. *Revelation*. Smyth & Helwys Bible Commentary. Macon, Ga.: Smyth & Helwys, 2001.
- Resseguie, James L. *The Revelation of John: A Narrative Commentary*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2009.
- . *Revelation Unsealed: A Narrative Critical Approach to John's Apocalypse*. Biblical Interpretation Series 32. Leiden: Brill, 1998.
- Ringe, Sharon H. *Jesus, Liberation, and the Biblical Jubilee: Images for Ethics and Christology*. Overtures to Biblical Theology. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1985.
- Rissi, Mathias. *The Future of the World: An Exegetical Study of Rev. 19.11–22.15*. Studies in Biblical Theology 23. London: SCM Press, 1972.
- Robbins, Gregory Allen, ed. *Genesis 1–3 in the History of Exegesis: Intrigue in the Garden*. Studies in Women and Religion 27. Lewiston: Edwin Mellen Press, 1988.
- Roberts, J. J. M. "Myth versus History: Relaying the Comparative Foundations." Pages 59–71 in *The Bible and the Ancient Near East: Collected Essays*. Winona Lake, In.: Eisenbrauns, 2002.
- Robinson, J. A. T. *Redating the New Testament*. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1976.
- Rohde, Erwin. *Psyche: The Cult of Souls and Belief in Immortality among the Greeks*. 2 vols. Translated by W. Hillis. Translation of the 8th ed. New York: Harper & Row, 1966.
- Romm, James S. *The Edges of the Earth in Ancient Thought: Geography, Exploration, and Fiction*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1992.
- Rossing, Barbara R. *The Choice between Two Cities: Whore, Bride and Empire in the Apocalypse*. Harvard Theological Studies 48. Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press, 1999.
- Routledge, Robin L. "Death and Afterlife in the Old Testament." *Journal of European Baptist Studies* 3 (2003): 22–39.
- Rowland, Christopher. *Revelation*. Epworth Commentaries. London: Epworth Press, 1993.
- Royalty, Robert M., Jr. *The Streets of Heaven: The Ideology of Wealth in the Apocalypse of John*. Macon, Ga.: Mercer University Press, 1998.
- Rubin, Nissan, and Admiel Kosman. "The Clothing of the Primordial Adam as a Symbol of Apocalyptic Time in the Midrashic Sources." *Harvard Theological Review* 90 (1997): 155–74.
- Ruiten, Jacques van. "Eden and the Temple: The Rewriting of Genesis 2:4–3:24 in *The Book of Jubilees*." Pages 63–94 in *Paradise Interpreted: Representations of Biblical Paradise in Judaism and Christianity*. Edited by Gerard Luttikhuisen. Themes in Biblical Narrative 2. Leiden: Brill, 1999.
- . "The Intertextual Relationship Between Isaiah 65, 17–20 and Revelation 21, 1–5b." *Estudios Bíblicos* 51 (1993): 473–510.
- . "Visions of the Temple in the book of *Jubilees*." Pages 215–27 in *Gemeinde ohne Tempel—Community without Temple: Zur Substituierung und Transformation des Jerusalemer Tempels und seines Kults im Alten Testament, antiken Judentum und frühen Christentum*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 118. Edited by B. Ego, A. Lange and P. Pilhofer. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1999.
- Ruiz, Jean-Pierre. *Ezekiel in the Apocalypse: The Transformation of Prophetic Language in Revelation 16:17–19:10*. European University Studies 23/376. Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 1989.
- Russell, Jeffrey Burton. *A History of Heaven: The Singing Silence*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1997.
- Ryan, Sean Michael. *Hearing at the Boundaries of Vision: Education Informing Cosmology in Revelation 9*. Library of New Testament Studies 448. New York: T&T Clark, 2012.

- Sacchi, Paolo. "The 2005 Camaldoli Seminar on the Parables of Enoch: Summary and Prospects for Future Research." Pages 499–512 in *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man: Revisiting the Book of Parables*. Edited by G. Boccaccini. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007.
- Sargent, Lyman Tower. "Utopian Traditions: Themes and Variations." Pages 8–17 in *Utopia: The Search for the Ideal Society in the Western World*. Edited by R. Schaer, G. Claeys, and L. Sargent. New York: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- Scafi, Alessandro. *Mapping Paradise: A History of Heaven on Earth*. London: British Library, 2006.
- Schaer, Roland, Gregory Claeys, and Lyman Tower Sargent, eds. *Utopia: The Search for the Ideal Society in the Western World*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- Schellenberg, Ryan S. "Seeing the World Whole: Intertextuality and the New Jerusalem (Revelation 21–22)." *Perspectives in Religious Studies* 33 (2006): 467–76.
- Schiffman, Lawrence H. "Jerusalem in the Dead Sea Scrolls." Pages 73–88 in *The Centrality of Jerusalem: Historical Perspectives*. Edited by M. Poorthuis and C. Safrai. Kampen, Netherlands: Kok Pharos, 1996.
- Schmid, Hans Heinrich. *Salom "Frieden" im Alten Orient und im Alten Testament*. Stuttgarter Bibelstudien 51. Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1971.
- Schmid, Konrad, and Christoph Riedweg, eds. *Beyond Eden: The Biblical Story of Paradise (Genesis 2–3) and Its Reception History*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008.
- Schmidt, Brent James. *Utopian Communities of the Ancient World: Idealistic Experiments of Pythagoras, the Essenes, Pachomius, and Proclus*. Lewiston, NY: Edwin Mellen Press, 2010.
- Schmidt, Thomas E. "'And the Sea Was No More': Water as People, Not Place." Pages 233–49 in *To Tell the Mystery: Essays on New Testament Eschatology in Honor of Robert H. Gundry*. Edited by T. Schmidt and M. Silva. Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series 100. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994.
- Schweitzer, Albert. *The Quest of Historical Jesus*. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1906. Repr., Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 2001.
- . *The Mysticism of the Apostle Paul*. London: Black, 1931. Repr., Johns Hopkins University Press, 1998.
- Schweitzer, Steven James. *Reading Utopia in Chronicles*. Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies 442. New York: T&T Clark, 2007.
- . "Visions of the Future as Critique of the Present: Utopian and Dystopian Images of the Future in Second Zechariah." Pages 249–67 in *Utopia and Dystopia in Prophetic Literature*. Edited by E. Ben Zvi. Publications of the Finnish Exegetical Society 92. Helsinki: Finnish Exegetical Society; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2006.
- Segal, Alan F. "Heavenly Ascent in Hellenistic Judaism, Early Christianity and their Environment." *ANRW* 23.2:333–94. Part 2, *Principat*, 23.2. Edited by H. Temporini and W. Haase. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1980.
- . *Life after Death: A History of the Afterlife in the Religions of the West*. New York: Doubleday, 2004.
- . *Rebecca's Children: Judaism and Christianity in the Roman World*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1986.
- Segal, Howard P. *Utopias: A Brief History from Ancient Writings to Virtual Communities*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell, 2012.
- Setzer, Claudia. *Resurrection of the Body in Early Judaism and Early Christianity: Doctrine, Community, and Self-Definition*. Leiden: Brill, 2004.
- Sharkansky, Ira. *Governing Jerusalem: Again on the World's Agenda*. Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1996.
- Sharkey, Sarah Ann. "The Background of the Imagery of the Heavenly Jerusalem in the New Testament." Ph.D. diss., Catholic University of America, 1986.
- Sim, Unyong. *Das Himmliche Jerusalem in Apk. 21,1–22,5 im Kontext biblisch-jüdischer Tradition und antiken Städtebaus*. Bochumer Altertumswissenschaftliches Colloquium 25. Trier: Wissenschaftlicher Verlag, 1996.
- Simon, Louis. "L'utopie de la résurrection dans le Nouveau Testament." *Foi et Vie* 74 (1975): 23–36.

- Slater, Thomas B. "On the Social Setting of the Revelation to John." *New Testament Studies* 44 (1998): 232–56.
- Smalley, Stephen S. *The Revelation to John: A Commentary on the Greek Text of the Apocalypse*. Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity Press, 2005.
- Smit, Peter-Ben. *Fellowship and Food in the Kingdom: Eschatological Meals and Scenes of Utopian Abundance in the New Testament*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 2, 234. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008.
- . "Incense Revisited: Reviewing the Evidence for Incense as a Clue to the Christina Provenance of the *Greek Life* of Adam and Eve." *Novum Testamentum* 46 (2004): 369–75.
- Smith, Dennis E. "Messianic Banquet." Pages 788–91 in vol. 4 of *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*. Edited by D. N. Freedman. 6 vols. New York: Doubleday, 1992.
- . "The Messianic Banquet Reconsidered." Pages 64–73 in *The Future of Early Christianity*. Edited by B. Pearson, T. Kraabel, G. Nickelsburg. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991.
- Smith, Jonathan Z. *Map is Not Territory: Studies in the History of Religion*. Studies in Judaism in Late Antiquity 23. Leiden: Brill, 1978.
- Solmsen, Friedrich. "Achilles on the Island of the Blessed: Pindar vs. Homer and Hesiod." *The American Journal of Philology* 103 (1982): 19–24.
- Sourvinou-Inwood, Christiane. "To Die and Enter the House of Hades: Homer, Before and After." Pages 15–39 in *Mirrors of Mortality: Studies in the Social History of Death*. Edited by J. Whaley. London: Europa, 1981.
- . *'Reading' Greek Death: to the End of the Classical Period*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996.
- Spatafora, Andrea. *From the "Temple of God" to God as the Temple: A Biblical Theological Study of the Temple in the Book of Revelation*. Tesi Gregoriana Serie Teologia 27. Rome: Gregorian University Press, 1997.
- Spronk, Klaas. *Beatific Afterlife in Ancient Israel and the Ancient Near East*. Vluyn: Verlag Butzon and Bercker Kevelaer, 1986.
- Stager, Lawrence E. "Jerusalem and the Garden of Eden." *Eretz-Israel* 26 (1999): 183–94.
- Stanley, Christopher D. "Paul's 'Use' of Scripture: Why the Audience Matters." Pages 125–55 in *As it is Written: Studying Paul's Use of Scripture*. Edited by S. Porter and C. Stanley. Society of Biblical Literature Symposium Series 50. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2008.
- Stanley, John E. "The New Creation as a People and City in Revelation 21:1–22:5: An Alternative to Despair." *Asbury Theological Journal* 60 (2005): 25–38.
- Stemberger, Günter. *Der Leib der Auferstehung: Studien zur Anthropologie und Eschatologie des palästinischen Judentums in neutestamentlichen Zeitalter (ca. 170 v. Chr.–100 n. Chr.)*. Analecta biblica 56. Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1972.
- Stephens, Mark B. *Annihilation or Renewal?* Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 2.307. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011.
- Sterling, G. E. "Philo." Pages 789–93 in *Dictionary of New Testament Background*. Edited by C. Evans and S. Porter. Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity Press, 2000.
- Stevens, Susan T. "Charon's Obol and Other Coins in Ancient Funerary Practice." *Phoenix* 45 (1991): 215–29.
- Stolz, Fritz. "Paradiese und Gegenwelten." *Zeitschrift für Religionswissenschaft* 1 (1993): 5–24.
- Stone, Michael E. *Ancient Judaism: New Visions and Views*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2011.
- . *Armenian Apocrypha Relating to Adam and Eve*. Leiden: Brill, 1996.
- . "The Book of Enoch and Judaism in the Third Century B.C.E." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 40 [1978]: 479–92.
- . *A History of the Literature of Adam and Eve*. Society of Biblical Literature: Early Judaism and Its Literature 3. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992.
- . "Paradise in 4 Ezra iv.8 and vii.36, viii.52." *Journal of Jewish Studies* 17 (1966): 85–88.
- Stordalen, Terje. *Echoes of Eden: Genesis 2–3 and Symbolism of the Eden Garden in Biblical Hebrew Literature*. Contributions to Biblical Exegesis and Theology 25. Leuven: Peeters, 2000.

- . "Heaven on Earth—Or Not? Jerusalem as Eden in Biblical Literature." Pages 28–57 in *Beyond Eden: The Biblical Story of Paradise (Genesis 2–3) and Its Reception History*. Edited by Konrad Schmid and Christoph Riedweg. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008.
- Stroumsa, Guy G. "Introduction: The Paradise Chronotope." Pages 1–14 in *Paradise in Antiquity: Jewish and Christian Views*. Edited by M. Bockmuehl and G. Stroumsa. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010.
- Suleiman, Susan R. "Introduction: Varieties of Audience-Oriented Criticism." Pages 3–45 in *The Reader in the Text: Essays on Audience and Interpretation*. Edited by S. R. Suleiman and I. Crosman. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1980.
- Sweet, John P. M. *Revelation*. Westminster Pelican Commentaries. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1979.
- Talbert, Charles H. *The Apocalypse: A Reading of the Revelation of John*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1994.
- Tarn, William W. and Guy T. Griffith. *Hellenistic Civilisation*. 3rd ed. London: Edward Arnold, 1952.
- Taylor, Joan E., and Philip R. Davies. "The So-Called Therapeutae of *De Vita Contemplativa*: Identity and Character." *Harvard Theological Review* 91(1998): 3–24.
- Thom, Johan C. "The Mind is its Own Place': Defining the Topos." Pages 555–73 in *Early Christianity and Classical Culture: Comparative Studies in Honor of Abraham J. Malherbe*. Edited by J. T. Fitzgerald, T. H. Olbricht, and L. M. White. Novum Testamentum Supplements 110. Leiden: Brill, 2003.
- Thompson, Leonard L. *The Book of Revelation: Apocalypse and Empire*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1990.
- . "Ordinary Lives: John and His First Readers." Pages 25–47 in *Reading the Book of Revelation: A Resource for Students*. Edited by D. Barr; Resources for Biblical Literature 44. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2003.
- Tigheelaar, Eibert J. C. "Eden and Paradise: The Garden Motif in Some Early Jewish Texts (1 Enoch and other Texts Found at Qumran)." Pages 37–62 in *Paradise Interpreted: Representations of Biblical Paradise in Judaism and Christianity*. Edited by Gerard P. Luttikhuisen. Themes in Biblical Narrative 2. Leiden: Brill, 1999.
- Toepel, Alexander. "When Did Adam Wear the Garments of Light?" *Journal of Jewish Studies* 61 (2010): 62–71.
- Toon, Peter. *Heaven and Hell: A Biblical and Theological Overview*. Nashville: Thomas Nelson Publishers, 1986.
- Trebilco, Paul. *The Early Christians in Ephesus from Paul to Ignatius*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004. Repr., Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007.
- . *Jewish Communities in Asia Minor*. Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series 69. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.
- Treu, Kurt. "Der Tod in der attischen Neuen Komödie." *Jahrbuch für Antike und Christentum* 9 (1982): 21–29.
- Troiani, Lucio. "L'Utopia in alcuni testi della letteratura ebraica di eta greca." Pages 49–56 in *Utopia e utopie nel pensiero storico antico. Centro Ricerche e Documentazione sull'Antichità Classica*. Edited by Chiara Carsana and Maria Teresa Schettino. Monografie 30. Roma: "L'Erma" di Bretschneider, 2008.
- Tromp, Johannes. *The Life of Adam and Eve in Greek: A Critical Edition*. Pseudepigrapha Veteris Testamenti Graece 6. Leiden: Brill, 2005.
- Tromp, Nicholas J. *Primitive Conceptions of Death and the Nether World in the Old Testament*. Biblica et orientalia 21. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1969.
- Tuplin, Christopher. *Achaemenid Studies*. Historia Einzelschriften 99. Stuttgart: Steiner, 1996.
- Uffenheimer, Binyamin. "From Prophetic to Apocalyptic Eschatology." Pages 200–217 in *Eschatology in the Bible and in Jewish and Christian Tradition*. Edited by Henning G. Reventlow. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997.
- . "Utopia and Reality in Biblical Thought." *Immanuel* 9 (1979): 5–15.

- Uhlig, Siegbert. *Apokalypsen: Das äthiopische Henochbuch*. Jüdische Schriften aus hellenistisch-römischer Zeit 5/6. Gütersloher: Gerd Mohn, 1984.
- Vanhoye, Albert. "L'utilisation du livre d'Ezéchiel dans l'Apocalypse." *Biblica* 43 (1962): 436–77.
- Vogelgesang, Jeffrey Marshall. "The Interpretation of Ezekiel in the Book of Revelation." Ph.D. diss., Harvard University, 1985.
- Von Möllendorff, Peter. *Auf der Suche nach der verlogenen Wahrheit: Lukians Wahre Geschichten*. Tübingen: G. Narr Verlag, 2000.
- . "Christian Apocalypses and Their Mimetic Potential in Pagan Education: A Contribution Concerning Lucian's *True History*." Pages 157–69 in *Reading the Bible Intertextually*. Edited by R. Hays, S. Alkier, and L. Huizenga. Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2008.
- Wälchli, Philipp. *Studien zu den literarischen Beziehungen zwischen Plutarch und Lukian ausgehend von Plutarch: De genio Socratis und Lukian: Philopseudeis*. Munich: K. G. Saur, 2003.
- Walker, Peter W. L. "The Land in the Apostles' Writings." Pages 81–99 in *The Land of Promise: Biblical, Theological and Contemporary Perspectives*. Edited by P. Johnston and P. Walker. Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity Press, 2000.
- Walker, Peter W. L., ed. *Jesus and the Holy City: New Testament Perspectives on Jerusalem*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996.
- Walker, Roy. *The Golden Feast: A Perennial Theme in Poetry*. London: Rockliff, 1952.
- Wallace, Howard N. *The Eden Narrative*. Harvard Semitic Monographs 32. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1985.
- Walsh, Carey Ellen. *The Fruit of the Vine: Viticulture in Ancient Israel*. Harvard Semitic Monographs 60. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2000.
- Webber, Randall C. "The Apocalypse as Utopia: Ancient and Modern Subjectivity." Pages 104–118 in *Society of Biblical Literature 1993 Seminar Papers*. Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Paper Series 32. Edited by E. H. Lovering. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1993.
- Wenham, Gordon J. "Sanctuary Symbolism in the Garden of Eden." Pages 399–404 in *I Studied Inscriptions from before the Flood: Ancient Near Eastern, Literary, and Linguistic Approaches to Genesis 1–11*. Sources for Biblical and Theological Study 4. Edited by R. Hess and D. Tsumura. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 1994.
- Westermann, Claus. *Genesis 1–11: A Commentary*. Translated by J. J. Scullion. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1974.
- Wilson, Mark. "The Early Christians in Ephesus and the Date of Revelation, Again." *Neotestamentica* 39 (2005): 163–93.
- Wilson, Steven G. *Related Strangers: Jews and Christians 70–170 C.E.* Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 1995.
- Winter, Michael. *Compendium utopiarum: Typologie und Bibliographie literarischer Utopien*. Vol. I: *Von der Antike bis zur deutschen Frühaufklärung*. Stuttgart: J. B. Metzler, 1978.
- Witherington, Ben, III. *Revelation*. New Cambridge Bible Commentary. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.
- Wright, J. Edward. *The Early History of Heaven*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- Wright, N. T. *The Resurrection of the Son of God*. Vol. 3 of *Christian Origins and the Question of God*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2003.
- Wyatt, Nicolas. "Interpreting the Creation and Fall Story in Genesis 2–3." *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 93 (1981): 10–21.
- Zeller, Eduard. *The Stoics, Epicureans, and Skeptics*. Translated by Oswald J. Reichel. London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1870.
- Zemler-Cizewski, Wanda. "The Apocryphal Life of Adam and Eve: Recent Scholarly Work." *Anglican Theological Review* 86 (2004): 671–77.

INDEX OF ANCIENT SOURCES

HEBREW SCRIPTURES

Genesis		32:1–6	130n142
2:4–3:24	284	33:2	195
2:5	192	33:3	141n176
2:8	160	34:29	170n253
2:10–14	141	40:34–38	169n251
2:11–12	95, 217		
2:15	192	Leviticus	
2:16–17	196	10:10	254
2:19	196	12:2–5	97n44
2:25	187	12:5	137
3:7	187, 189n301	16	189, 190
3:8–9	138, 196	19:5–8	155
3:14–24	254	19:31	110–111n92
3:14	260	20:6	110–111n92
3:16–17	262	20:24	141n176
3:17–19	193, 260	20:27	110–111n92
3:21	188n300, 190	22:29–30	155
3:22–23	161, 210, 240	25	103
3:24	210, 213n37	25:1–26:13	105, 136, 285
12:3	182	25:20–21	154n210
13:10	89	25:23	136
15:12–21	101	25:36–37	131n145
19:24	244n139	26	156n215, 178
24:22	134	26:6	174
		26:10	154n210
		26:12	196, 256n178, 264
Exodus		Numbers	
3:8	141n176	6:25	169n251
3:17	141n176	11:31–32	154n210
13:5	141n176	13:23	154n210
13:21–22	195	13:27	141n176
14:19–24	195	14:8	141n176
15:26	187	16:13	141n176
16:1–34	154n210	16:14	141n176
19:9	198	20:16	195
20:23	130n142	34:1–35:15	101
21:2	136		
22:25	131n145	Deuteronomy	
23:10–12	136	3:12–20	101
23:20–33	176n268, 195, 285	6:3	141n176
23:25	154n210, 186	7:15	186
23:31	101	7:25	130n142
28:3	191	8	141n174
28:6–30	216n46	8:1–20	105, 285
28:11–19	284	8:7–10	134, 142, 154
28:15–21	188, 216	10:14	136
28:17–20	95n36, 134		
29:10–13	134		

- | | | | |
|--------------|------------------------------------|--------------|--|
| 10:19 | 182n284 | 2 Chronicles | |
| 11:8–25 | 105, 285 | 3:1–7:22 | 126, 134, 285 |
| 11:9 | 141n176 | 3:7 | 210n25 |
| 11:24 | 101 | 5:13–6:1 | 198 |
| 11:10–15 | 154n212, 154–55 | 7:1–3 | 169n251 |
| 15:1–18 | 102, 136 | 7:5 | 155 |
| 15:4–5 | 136 | 9:17–18 | 127 |
| 18:11 | 111 | 33:6 | 110–111n92 |
| 23:19–20 | 131n145 | | |
| 26:9 | 141n176 | Ezra | |
| 26:15 | 141n176 | 6:17 | 155n214 |
| 27:3 | 141n176 | | |
| 29:22 | 244n139 | Nehemiah | |
| 31:20 | 141n176 | 5:7 | 131n145 |
| 34:42 | 152 | 5:10–11 | 131n145 |
| | | 9:25 | 154n210 |
| Joshua | | Job | |
| 5:6 | 141n176 | 3:17–20 | 109 |
| 13:1–21:45 | 101 | 7:9 | 109 |
| 21:45 | 101 | 11:8 | 110n91 |
| Judges | | 14:13 | 109 |
| 2:1 | 195 | 17:16 | 109 |
| 9:15 | 219n56 | 18:15 | 244n139 |
| 17:4 | 130n142 | 26:5 | 110n91 |
| 1 Samuel | | 36:31 | 154n210 |
| 28:6–25 | 110–111n92 | 37:22 | 251n161 |
| 1 Kings | | Psalms | |
| 5:1–8:66 | 126, 134, 138, 174,
215n41, 285 | 6:6 | 110n91 |
| 5:3–4 | 174, 176n268 | 8:5 | 251n161 |
| 5:17 | 134 | 17:8 | 172n258 |
| 6:13 | 134, 137, 196 | 19:1 | 169n251 |
| 6:18–23 | 134, 226n84 | 22:27–29 | 117n110, 182n284,
182n286, 218n54,
256n179 |
| 6:23–38 | 155n213, 210n25, 213n37 | 24:1 | 136 |
| 7 | 134 | 28:1 | 251n161 |
| 8:10–12 | 169n251, 196, 198 | 29:1 | 169n251 |
| 8:13 | 196 | 29:5 | 219n56 |
| 8:63 | 155 | 36:7 | 172n258 |
| 10:18 | 127 | 45:8–9 | 251n159 |
| 10:23–25 | 117n110, 218n54 | 47:7–9 | 117n110, 182n284,
182n286, 218n54,
256n179 |
| 2 Kings | | 50:12 | 136 |
| 19:23 | 219n56 | 57:1 | 172n258 |
| 21:6 | 110–111n92 | 57:5 | 110n91 |
| 23:24 | 110–111n92 | 63:7 | 172n258 |
| 1 Chronicles | | 68:29 | 117n110, 218n54 |
| 11 | 89 | 69:34 | 110n91 |
| 10:13 | 110–111n92 | 72:9–11 | 117n110, 218n54,
251n159 |
| 12:40 | 154n210 | 80:10 | 172n258 |
| 29:11 | 136 | | |

86:9	117n110, 182n286, 218n54, 256n179	Isaiah 1:19	154n210
88:5	110n91	2	182
88:12	110n91	2:1-4	117n110, 182n286, 218n54, 256n179, 286
89:11	136		182
91:1	172n258	2:2-3	175
94:17	110n91	2:4	126
95:7	251n161	2:6-8	219n56
97:6	169n251	2:13	130n142
102:15	251n159	2:20	188n300
102:21-22	117n110, 182n284, 182n286, 218n54, 256n179	4:5 4:6 7:11	172n258 110n91 111n92
104:16	219n56	8:19	171
108:5	169n251	9:2	154n210
115:16	110n91	9:3	101, 175n267
115:17	110n91	9:6-7	179n276
121:5	172n258	11	101
122:3-4	117n110, 182n286, 218n54, 256n179	11:1-5 11:6-9 11:10	178-179 101 117n110, 182n286, 218n54, 256n179
135:6	110n91	11:10-12	167n245, 198n329, 248
136:17-18	251n159	12:5-6	264n202
138:4-5	117n110, 182n284, 182n286, 218n54, 251n159, 256n179	12:6 14:8 16:4-5 18:7	219n56 101 117n110, 218n54 111n92
148:11	251n159	19:3	182n284
Proverbs		19:19-22	130n141, 131
3:2	109-110n90	23:1-18	169n251, 251n159
3:10	148	24:23	286
3:14	134	25:1-27:13	112
3:18	158n222, 159n225	25-26	151, 153
8:10	134	25	167n245, 248n152
8:18-21	134n156	25:1	172n258
8:19	134	25:4-5	150, 153, 182n284
11:30	158n222, 159n225	25:6-8	148n194, 154n210
13:12	158n222, 159n225	25:6	151n203, 192, 252, 258, 259n188
15:4	158n222, 159n225	25:8	112n95, 248
15:11	110n91	26	167n245, 248
20:1	147n192	26:1	182n284, 248
21:17	147n192	26:2	175n267
22:1	134	26:3	111
23:29-31	147n192	26:19	154n210
25:11-12	134	27:2-6	154n210
28:8	131n145	27:12-13	168, 249n154
31:4	147n192	30:26	244n139
Ecclesiastes		30:33	101, 172n258
9:10	110-111n92	32:1-2	175n267, 185n290
Song of Songs		32:16-18	286
4:10-16	163-164, 163-164n240, 165n243	33:15-22	184n288
5:15	219n56	33:15	

33:16	154n210	60:4-14	154n210
33:21	144, 198n329, 264n202	60:5-6	134, 218n54, 219
34:9	244n139	60:6	220
35:1-10	132n148, 186, 286	60:7	139n167, 194n323, 220
35:4	192n314, 258n187	60:9	134
35:5-6	186	60:10	194n323, 251n159
35:6-7	144	60:11	181, 219, 251n159
35:9	178n175, 179n276	60:13	139n168, 219, 224
35:10	166, 191-192, 192n314, 259, 258n187, 259, 262	60:15	192n313
37:24	219n56	60:16	251n159
38:18	110n91	60:17-18	134, 175n267
40:3-5	165	60:19-20	168, 169n251, 182n284, 192n314, 249, 258n187
40:4	166	61:1-3	103, 192n314, 259, 258n187
40:5	169n251	61:5-6	117n110, 134, 218n54
40:19	130n142	61:5	148n194, 194n323
41:15	166	61:10	189
41:18-19	124, 132n148	62:2	251n159
42:6	172, 182n284	62:6	213n37
42:15	166	62:8-9	194n322
42:16	171n255	64:1-2	198n329, 264n202
43:19-20	124, 132n148	65-66	258n186, 286
44:3-4	132n148	65:13-16	150n202
44:27	229n95	65:17-25	132n148
45:2	166	65:18-19	192n314, 259, 258n187
49:6	171, 172, 182n284	65:19	258n186, 258n186, 262n194
49:9-12	150n202	65:21-23	194, 194n322, 261, 262
49:11	166	65:22	158n222
49:22-23	117n110, 182n286, 218n54, 256n179	65:25	89, 178n275
49:55	150n202	66:1	198n329, 264n202
50:2	229n95	66:6	224
51:3	89, 132n148, 154n210	66:11	171n254
51:8-11	229	66:12	117n110, 134, 218n54
51:11	192n314, 258n187	66:18	117n110, 182n286, 218n54, 256n179
52:8	198n329, 264n202	66:23	117n110, 182n286, 218n54, 246n147, 256n179
52:10	182n284		
54:11-12	134, 215-216		
55:1-2	148, 154n210		
55:5	182n284		
55:11	262		
55:12	167, 192n314, 258n187	Jeremiah	
55:13	132n148	3:17	11n110, 182n286, 256n179
56:5-8	117n110, 182n286, 218n54, 256n179	7:23	256n178
58:8	169n251, 171n255	9:23-24	130n140
58:10	171n255	11:5	141n176
60:1-62:12	286	13:12	147n192
60	218, 219, 251	17:11	130n143
60:1-5	172, 250	22:23	219n56
60:1	169n251	23:5-6	101
60:2	169n251	25:14	251n159
60:3-17	117n110, 182n286, 218n54, 256n179	25:18	251n159
60:3	219, 182n284, 251n159	30:1-31:40	176n268, 286
		30:17	175n267

30:19	167	36:8-38	286
30:22	264n203	36:26-27	185
31:1	264n203	36:28	264n203
31:4	167, 248n152	36:29-30	154n210, 156
31:5	148n194	36:33-36	194n322
31:7	167	36:35	89, 124, 238
31:12	148, 154n210	37	112, 112n95
31:13	192n314, 258n187	37:7-10	111
31:31	185	37:23	264n203
31:33	264n203	37:24-28	101
32:22	141n176	37:27	264
32:38	264n203	38-39	227n88
33:6	175n267	38:12	117
33:9	171n254	40-48	100, 139, 209n22, 224,
40:12	148		227, 227n88, 285, 286
		43:2	169, 198
Ezekiel		43:4-7	198
1	227n88	43:7	264n203
2	227n88	43:9	264n203
7:19-20	130	44:6-9	181
9-10	227n88	47	88n15, 92n28, 116, 124,
16	227n88		210, 233, 236, 238,
17:23	172n258		240n127
18:8	131n145	47:1-12	237n121
18:13	131n145	47:1	146
18:17	131n145	47:3-6	146
20:6	141n176	47:8-9	146, 233
20:15	141n176	47:12	146, 156, 186, 233,
22:12	131n145		237, 239n124, 242,
23	227n88	48:35	245n142, 246n144
26-28	227n88		139, 198, 265
27-28	131, 216		
28	87n10, 88n15, 89,	Daniel	
	174n264, 188, 217n50,	7:9	189n304
	217n51, 238	10:5	189n304
28:1-10	130n141	12	112, 112n95, 113, 121
28:12-15	89, 92n28	12:1-3	110, 113
28:13	95n36, 134, 188, 216,	12:3	113n98, 186n294
	217	12:7	189n304
28:14	197, 210, 213n37		
28:15	184	Hosea	
28:16	174n264, 210	2:8	130n142
28:22	244n139	2:18	175, 178n275
31	87n10, 88n15, 158n222,	6:2	111, 112n95
	164, 238	14:1-9	286
31:2-9	89, 158n222	14:4-7	163
31:9	238	14:7	148n193, 172n258
31:16	238		
31:18	238	Joel	
34:11-31	150n202, 154n210, 286	1:20	228
34:11	198, 264n202	2:3	89
34:16	186	2:18-27	154n210
34:25	175n267, 178n275	2:19-29	148n194, 287
34:26-29	156	2:20	176, 181
34:30	198, 264n202	2:27	198, 264n202

3:16–21	287	3:8–15	228
3:17	181, 198, 264n202		
3:18	92n28, 139n168, 143n183, 146, 233	Zephaniah	
	181	1:18	130n140
3:19	198, 264n202	3:8–13	150n202, 182n284
3:21	154n210	3:10	117n110, 182n286, 218n54, 256n179
4:18		3:14–20	167n245, 248n152
Amos			
7:4	228	Haggai	
9	156n215	2:6–9	117n110, 218n54
9:2	110n91	2:22–23	101
9:11–15	287		
9:12	182n284	Zechariah	
9:13–14	148n194, 154n210	2:10–11	264n203
9:13	143n183, 156, 194, 235	3:4–5	191n311
		3:8	101
Jonah		6:12	101
2:5	110n91	8:1–23	287
		8:3	198n329, 264n202, 264n203
Micah			
4:1–5:15	287	8:8	264n203
4:1–2	117n110, 182n284, 182n286, 198n329, 218n54, 256n179, 264n202	8:12	148n194, 175n267
		8:13	182
4:1	139n168	8:20–23	117n110, 182n286, 183, 218n54, 256n179
4:3	175	8:23	198n329
4:4	148n194, 154n210	9:9–17	150n202
4:6–7	186, 264n202	9:17	154n210
5:1–4	101	10:10–12	229n95
5:4–5	176n268	14	88n15, 172, 176n268, 220, 287
6:11–12	130n143	14:1	132
7:9	171	14:6	172
7:17	89	14:7	168, 219n55, 249n154
		14:8	92n28, 146, 233
Nahum		14:11	253, 261, 267, 273
1:4	228	14:14	132, 134, 220
		14:16–17	117n110, 182n286, 183, 218n54, 246n147, 256n179
Habakkuk			139n168
1:10	251n159		
3:3–4	169n251	14:20–21	

NEW TESTAMENT

Matthew		Luke	
6:24	39n98	10:18	217n51
15:11	254	16:13	39n98
15:18	254	16:19–31	132
15:20	254	17:29	244n139
22:23	114n102	20:27	114n102
		23:43	210n23
Mark			
11:15–19	225	John	
12:18	114n102	2:13–22	225
13:2	225		

Acts		3:20	235n113
2	223n68	3:21	222n64
4	223n68	4:4	258n184
10:14	254	4:8	246
23:8	114n102	4:9	247n149
		4:10	247, 269
Romans		4:11	246
2:7	251n161	5:9	246, 255
2:10	251n161	5:10	247
14:14	254	5:11	246
		5:12–13	247n149
1 Corinthians		5:13	246
3:16	225	5:14	247
		6:6	235n112
2 Corinthians		6:11	258n184
5:1–2	225	6:15	251n158
6:16	225	7:4–8	241n129
11	119n117	7:9–12	247n149, 258n184
12:4	210n23	7:11	247
		7:13	258n184
Galatians		7:14	258, 258n184
3:28	206	7:15	226
		7:16–17	235n113
Colossians		7:17	233, 233n107, 259n188
4:13	261n192	10:9–10	235n113
		11:1	227
1 Timothy		11:9	229
6:10	39n98	11:16	247
		11:19	224
Hebrews		12:1	241n129
9:13	254	13:1	229
11:10	213, 213n35	14:1	241n129
13:5	51n39	14:3	241n129, 246
		14:8	235n112
1 John		14:10	235, 235n112, 244n139
3:8	217n51	14:14–20	235n112, 235n113
		15:3	246
Revelation		16:10–11	261
1:5	251n158	16:14	250
1:9	204	16:19	235n112
2–3	243n135	17:1–19:10	215n39
2:7	210n23, 222n64, 235n113, 236n115, 238, 239, 240n127, 241	17–18	217
		17:2	235n112, 251n158
		17:4	215
2:9	202n45	17:14	269
2:11	222n64, 240n125	17:16	235n113
2:14	235n113	17:18	251n158
2:20	235n113	18:3	235n112, 251n158
3:4	258n184	18:9	251n158
3:5	222n64, 240n125, 258n184	18:13	220n59, 235n112
		18:16	215
3:12	222n64, 240n125	19:7–9	235n113
3:17	202n5	19:14	258n184
3:18	243n135, 258n184	19:15–21	255n171, 257

19:15	235n112	21:11	249
19:16	269	21:12–21	213
19:17–18	235n113	21:12	210, 252
19:19	251n158	21:15	227
19:20	244n139	21:16	251
19:21	235n113	21:18–21	214, 216, 216n46, 217
20	232	21:22	223, 224, 226
20:7–10	255n171, 257	21:23	248, 249, 250
20:10	244n139	21:24–27	218, 219, 220, 229, 232, 256, 257
20:12	240n125	21:24	214, 219, 249, 250, 251, 251n158, 255, 258
20:13	229, 230	21:25	219, 248, 252
20:14	230, 240n125, 241	21:26	214, 219, 249, 250, 251, 255
20:15	240n125	21:27	240n125, 254
21	208, 288	22	208, 243n138, 244, 288
21:1–5	228, 228n93, 259n189, 264, 264n201	22:1–5	242
21:1	227, 228, 229, 232, 259	22:1–2	214, 233, 236, 237n121
21:2	213, 214, 243n135	22:1	227, 233, 260
21:3	230, 247, 256, 256n178, 257, 259, 264, 264n203, 265	22:2	210, 214, 233, 234, 234n111, 236, 237, 238, 239n124, 240n127, 242, 245, 245n142, 251, 255, 257
21:4	228n93, 230, 241, 252, 259, 259n188, 260, 260n190, 261, 261n192, 262, 263, 263n199, 266, 268, 273	22:3	222n64, 226, 240n125, 253, 253n165, 254, 254n167, 257, 260, 261, 263, 264, 267, 273
21:5	227	22:5	247, 248, 249, 264
21:6	236n114	22:14	235n113, 236n115, 239, 258
21:7	222	22:17	233, 235
21:6	213, 214, 227, 233, 234n111	22:19	235n113, 236n115, 239
21:8	214, 232, 244n139		
21:9–22:9	215n39		
21:9	208		

Apocrypha

Baruch (Bar)

1:20	141n176
4:30–5:9	287
4:30	115
5:1–9	171n254, 179, 184n288, 190, 250n157
5:4	175n267
5:7–8	165
5:8	172n258

Epistle of Jeremiah (Ep Jer)

1:4	130n142
-----	---------

1 Maccabees (1 Macc)

1:47	254
1:62	254
14:21	251

2 Maccabees (2 Macc)

2:4–8	139
5:16	117n110, 218n54
6	115n104
7	115n104
11:8	189n304

4 Maccabees (4 Macc)

7:6	254
13:17	179
16:25	179

Sirach (Sir)

5:8	130n143
6:29–31	188n300
10:10–11	114n101
11:14	135

14:16–19	114n101	49:16	188n300
17:27–30	114n101	50:11	188
26:29	129n139, 130n144, 174n264	Tobit (Tob)	
29:1–29	129n139, 174n264	3:6	114n101
31:1–19	129n139, 174n264	3:10	114n101
31:27–30	149n198	4:10	114n101
31:27	149	5:10	114n101
34:19	172n258	12:8	130n144
38:21	114n101	13:8	182n284
40:13	130n143	13:11	117n110, 172, 182n284, 183, 218n54, 250
40:18	174n264		
40:27	188n300	13:16–17	134
41:4	114n101	13:16	216
46:8	141n176	14:5	140–141
46:19–20	114n101	14:6–7	183
49:14	114n101	14:10	114n101
49:16–50:1	188		

Pseudepigrapha

<i>Apocalypse of Abraham (Apoc. Ab.)</i>	21.22–25	177n270
13.10	190n306	151n203
13.14	189, 190, 258n185	121, 287
17.18–19	170	151, 152, 153, 245
21–23	95n37, 118–119, 284, 287	153
23.6	149n197, 160n228	157
27	118n113	148, 235
29.11–13	119n114	166, 244
		181n283
		121, 287
<i>Apocalypse of Zephaniah (Apoc. Zeph.)</i>	48.48–51.16	168n248, 249n154
2.6–7	168, 249n154, 287	121
6.1–3	145	186–187
6.11	170	121, 189n303, 258n185
6.16	145	121, 187
7.9	145	90, 95n35, 284
8.1–12.8	287	195n325
9.2	145	177n270
9.4–5	180	125n128, 158n221
10.7	130–131	139n171
<i>Ascension of Isaiah (Ascen. Isa.)</i>	72.1–74.3	102, 287
9.6–18	189n303, 258n185	177
		176n269, 177
<i>2 Baruch (2 Bar.)</i>	73.1	187n295
4	90	195, 260
4.1–7	87n13, 90, 95n35, 121, 122, 125, 137n161, 139, 210, 224, 284, 285, 287	157n217
		177
4.3	139, 140	139
6.7–9	139	83.4–5
14.18–19	176–177	83.8
15.7–8	177n270, 184n288	83.11–23
21.12–18	177n270	85.5
		177n273
		121

3 *Baruch* (3 *Bar.*)

2.1	146n188		210, 239n124, 244,
3.10–17	160n228, 180n277	24.4	244n140, 245
4	119n117		164, 239n124, 245,
4.10–17	149	24.5	245n142
4.15	160n228	25.4	90, 119–120n117
4.16	188n300	25.5	161n230
10.1–10	146n188		116, 161, 161n234,
11–16	140n172	25.6	184n288, 245

4 *Baruch* (4 *Bar.*)

3.8–11	139	26–27	245
9.3	172n257	29–31	165n242
		29.2	244
		29.5–6	157
		29.8	157

Pseudo-Philo, *Biblical Antiquities* (L.A.B.)

11.15	94, 121, 158n221	32	90, 116, 116n106, 159,
13.8–9	95, 158n221		160, 162, 163n240, 164,
19.10–13	94, 121, 284, 287	32.1–6	239n124, 284
19.12	169n250, 198n329,	32.4	90
	264n202	32.5	149n197, 160n28
19.13	137n161, 175n267	37–71	164, 243
22.8	95n34	38.1	118, 127, 287
25.11–26.15	94, 121, 284, 287	39	184n288
25.11	169n250, 217	43.1–4	184n288
26.10–11	216n45	45.4–5	121
26.12	218	50.1	118
26.13–15	218	50.2–5	168n248, 249n154
26.13	95, 169n250	52	182n284
32.8	94, 121, 163n240, 165,	52.6	118, 127, 287
	166, 243, 284, 287	52.7	128
51.5	168n248, 249n154	52.8–9	176

1 *Enoch* (1 *En.*)

1–36	127, 159	52.9	128
3	161n232	58.1–6	118, 184n288, 287
5	161n232	58.3	170
7.1–8.4	126	58.6	168, 168n248, 249n154
8.1	126, 176	60	90, 284
10.16–22	116, 184n288, 287	60.8	90, 118, 180, 284
10.17	175n267	60.23	90, 162n236, 284
10.18–19	116, 161n232	61	90, 284
10.19	148, 156–157, 235,	61.12	118, 162n236
	241–242	62.1–63.12	132n149
10.21–22	185	62.12–16	118, 152, 153, 287
10.21	182n284	62.14	151, 152
11.2	175	62.15–16	190, 258n185
14	126, 127	63.2	132
14.8–25	140n172	63.5	132
14.13	140n172	63.7	132
18	127, 128	63.10	132
18.6–8	127	69.6	176n269
24–27	287	69.28–29	184n288
24–25	116, 116n106, 119n117,	70	90
	127n132, 159, 160n229,	70.3–4	90, 162n236, 284
	162, 163n240, 164,	70.4	118, 180
		71.1	258n185
		71.6	175n267

72-82	90n19	48.10	151
77.3	162n236		
90.28-29	224	4 <i>Ezra</i>	
90.30	182n284	2	245
90.37-38	182n284	2.12	165n244, 243, 243n137
91-107	129	2.35	168n248, 249n154
91.18	184n288	2.38	151
92.4	169n250	2.45	190
94.7-9	129	4.7-8	120, 284, 288
96	184n288	4.8	90
96.94	129n138	6.44	156n216, 165n244,
97.8-10	129n138		243n137
97.8	130	7.36	90, 120, 120nn19, 284,
98.1-4	129n138		288
102.4-103.4	122n122, 287	7.88-101	120nn19
102.8	169n250	7.97	121
103.6	129n138	7.102-105	120nn19
103.9-104.6	287	7.106-131	120nn19
104.2-6	121	7.112-115	184n288
108.12	258m185	7.123	90, 120, 154n210, 284,
			288
2 <i>Enoch</i> (2 <i>En.</i>)		8.25	120
8.1-9.1	90, 121, 284, 287	8.35-36	120nn19
8	91, 119nn17, 163n240,	8.51-52	120
	166	8.52	163, 241, 284, 288
8.2	165	8.53	151n203
8.3	162, 165, 197, 241, 243	8.55	120
8.5	143, 147	13.37-38	181
8.8	167, 197, 213, 248n152		
9.1	184n288	<i>Jubilees</i> (<i>Jub.</i>)	
22.8-10	258m185	1.7	142
22.8	188n300	1.27-29	224
22.9	243n135	1.29	116, 140, 142, 175n267,
31	91		249n154, 288
31.1-8	90, 284	2.1	197
31.1	167n246, 197n327,	2.7	92, 124
	248n152	2.9	197
31.2	167-168	2.15	197
42	91	3	97
42.3-14	90, 121, 284, 288	3.8-35	88, 284
42.3	91	3.9-12	137
42.4	167n246, 184n288,	3.12	92, 124, 138
	197n327, 248n152	3.15-16	91
42.5	151, 152, 180	3.15	193
65.9-10	168n248, 249n154	3.16	174n264
		3.23-25	197
3 <i>Enoch</i> (3 <i>En.</i>)		3.26	188n297
5.1-6	168n248, 197n327,	3.27	92, 124
	249n154	3.28	91-92, 174n264
5.3	170	3.35	91
5.4	186n292	4.21-26	117nn11, 197n328, 284
5.7	130n142	4.23	92, 179
12.1	188n300	4.24	179n277
23.18	165n244, 243n137	4.26	137n162, 288
45	140n172	8.12	117

- | | | | |
|----------|-----------------------|----------|---------|
| 8.19-30 | 284 | 11.16-24 | 190 |
| 8.19 | 92, 124, 137n162, 138 | 11.19 | 172 |
| 8.30 | 173n260 | 15.1-2 | 169-170 |
| 15.26 | 181 | 15.8 | 190n308 |
| 23.22-31 | 116, 175n267, 288 | 20.7 | 190 |
| 23.25 | 186 | 21.3 | 190n308 |
| 23.27-28 | 186 | 25.8 | 190 |
-
- | | | | |
|---|-----------------------|--------------------------------------|---------|
| <i>Letter of Aristeeas (Let. Aris.)</i> | | <i>Pseudo-Phocylides (Ps.-Phoc.)</i> | |
| 51-120 | 134n154, 138, 212n32, | 5 | 130n143 |
| | 285 | 10 | 130n143 |
| 98-99 | 191 | 30 | 135n159 |
| 100-102 | 175 | 42-47 | 128 |
| 107-113 | 194 | 42 | 129 |
| 112-114 | 138 | 75 | 192n315 |
| 112 | 142n181, 148n195, 155 | 162 | 192n315 |
| 118 | 175 | | |
-
- | | | | |
|--|------------------|--------------------------------------|------------------------|
| <i>Greek Life of Adam and Eve (G.L.A.E.)</i> | | <i>Psalms of Solomon (Pss. Sol.)</i> | |
| 13.1-5 | 118n112 | 2.34 | 184n288 |
| 13.6 | 118n112, 121n120 | 3.12 | 169n250 |
| 20.1-2 | 188-189 | 5.16-17 | 134-135n157 |
| 24-26 | 192n316 | 11.1-9 | 116, 285 |
| 24.1-2 | 192n316 | 11.5 | 165n243 |
| 27.1-5 | 165 | 14.3 | 159n225 |
| 28.1-29.6 | 284 | 14.10 | 159n225 |
| 28.1-4 | 165 | 17.21-46 | 101, 184n288, 285, 288 |
| 28.3-4 | 162, 241 | 17.22 | 184 |
| 28.4 | 118n112 | 17.28 | 184 |
| 29.1-6 | 165, 243 | 17.30-35 | 117n110, 182n284, |
| 36 | 243n135 | | 182n286, 218n54, |
| 36.1-3 | 168n248, 249n154 | | 256n179 |
| 37.3 | 145 | 17.30 | 116 |
| 37.5 | 121n120 | 17.31 | 172, 250 |
| 40.1 | 121n120 | 17.32 | 184n288 |
| 41.3 | 118n112 | 17.33 | 129n137, 175n267 |
| 43.3 | 118n112, 121n120 | 17.34 | 184 |
| | | 18.1-12 | 101 |
-
- | | | | |
|--|------------------|-------------------------------------|----------------------|
| <i>Latin Life of Adam and Eve (Vita)</i> | | <i>Sibylline Oracles (Sib. Or.)</i> | |
| 4.2 | 157n218 | 2.56 | 130 |
| 9 | 243n135 | 2.109-118 | 128, 130n143, 214n38 |
| 22.2 | 193n319 | 2.111 | 129n139 |
| 25.3 | 118n112, 121n120 | 2.313-339 | 194n324, 288 |
| 40.1 | 118n112 | 2.313-318 | 143 |
| | | 2.313-314 | 184n288 |
| <i>Odes of Solomon (Odes Sol.)</i> | | 2.315 | 144 |
| 6.8 | 147 | 2.316 | 169, 249n154 |
| 8.8 | 190n308 | 2.318 | 147 |
| 8.9 | 190 | 2.319-324 | 135 |
| 11.1-24 | 288 | 2.320-321 | 156n216 |
| 11.10-11 | 190n308 | 2.325-329 | 169, 249n154 |
| 11.11 | 190 | 2.336-338 | 145 |
| 11.12 | 195n325 | 3.41-42 | 130n144 |
| 11.13-14 | 169-170 | 3.55-61 | 131 |
| 11.15-16 | 166 | 3.180-182 | 130n144 |

3.188-189	130n143	10.6	180n278
3.234-236	129n137, 135	10.8	187n295
3.237	135	10.11	198n329, 264n202
3.241-247	135		
3.350-364	131	<i>Testament of Dan (T. Dan)</i>	
3.619-623	156n216	5.9-13	284, 288
3.640-641	129n137	5.9	102, 175n267
3.702-795	288	5.10-12	116
3.702-731	182n284	5.11	102, 175n267
3.702-709	140, 224, 253n164	5.12-13	171n254
3.706	178	5.12	117, 124, 210
3.710-731	117n110, 182n286, 218n54, 256n179	5.13	177, 198n329, 264n202
3.716-720	183	<i>Testament of Issachar (T. Iss.)</i>	
3.724-726	167	3.1-6.4	193n320
3.740	183	4.2	131n147
3.741-761	183		
3.744-749	143, 157	<i>Testament of Judah (T. Jud.)</i>	
3.745	148	19.1	131
3.750-751	157	22.2	182n284
3.751-756	178	25.1-5	122, 288
3.772-773	117n110, 166, 218n54	25.4	134n154
3.783	130n143	25.5	182n284
3.787	168n248, 171n254, 249n154	<i>Testament of Levi (T. Levi)</i>	
3.788-795	178, 179n276	2.11	182n284
4.179-192	288	3.5-6	140n172
4.187	184n288	4.1	228n90, 228n91
4.191	168n248, 249n154	4.4	182n284
5.155-160	228n90, 228n91	5.1	140n172
5.238-239	170	8.14	182n284
5.238-85	285	14.4	182n284
5.253-255	175	18.1-14	284, 288
5.261	135n158	18.1-4	122
5.263	167, 248n152	18.3	102
5.267	167, 248n152	18.4	169n250, 175n267
5.281-282	144, 154n210	18.9	182n284
5.414-433	224, 288	18.10	162, 213n37, 241, 285
5.416-417	130n143		
5.420-427	140n173, 171	<i>Testament of Naphtali (T. Naph.)</i>	
5.428	167, 248n152	8.3	177n273, 182n284
5.431	177n272		
5.447-448	228n90, 228n91	<i>Testament of Simeon (T. Sim.)</i>	
5.476-483	169, 249n154	5.1	187
5.492-502	182n284	6.7	151
12.192	44n116		
<i>Testament of Asher (T. Ash.)</i>		<i>Testament of Zebulun (T. Zeb.)</i>	
7.3	182n284	5.1-5	187n295
<i>Testament of Benjamin (T. Ben.)</i>		<i>Testament of Abraham (T. Ab.)</i>	
9.2	117n110, 141, 182n284, 182n286, 218n54, 256n179	11.1-10	121
	122, 288	20.10	189n303, 258n185
10.6-9		20.14	121, 151, 180n278, 194n324, 285, 288

Testament of Isaac (T. Isaac)

6.22 151
8.11 151

Testament of Moses (T. Mos.)

10.6 228n91
10.8–10 121

Testament of Jacob (T. Jac.)

7.21–28 151

*Dead Sea Scrolls**Damascus Document (CD)*

III, 20 96, 96n39, 170

Community Rule (1QS)

III, 19–IV, 1 168
IV, 7–8 189
IV, 15–26 170
IV, 23 96, 189
IX, 3–6 225

Rule of the Congregation (1QSa)

II, 11–22 151, 152, 153

Hodayot (1QH)

IV, 15 96
VI, 17–18 172

4Q171 96
4Q180 96

4Q216 142
4Q265 97, 137, 137n161
4Q303 96n39
4Q305 96n39
4Q369 96
4Q378 142, 143n182
4Q421 97n44
4Q422 96n39
4Q423 96n39
4Q499 96
4Q500 124n125
4Q504 96n39

11Q19 (11QTemple)

XXIX, 8–9 96–97
XXXVI, 11 216n42
XXXIX, 3 216n42
XLI, 15 216n42

*Josephus**Jewish Antiquities (Ant.)*

1.3–4 162n238, 163
1.4 92
1.37–51 94, 159n223, 285
1.38–39 141n175
1.38 97n44
1.41 94, 174n264
1.46–47 94, 191n312
1.49 261
8.1–129 134n155, 196n326
8.102 163, 167n245, 248n152
8.116–117 184
8.122 155n214
15.402 117n110, 218n54
18.18–22 103n70, 286
18.19 194
18.20 105, 105n77, 133n152, 136, 223n68

Jewish War (J.W.)

1.45–46 56nn16
2.119–161 103n70, 286

2.122 105n77, 133n152, 136, 223n68
2.124 124n127
2.125 175n266
2.127–131 105n78, 133n152, 136, 156
2.127 223n68
2.128 105n76
2.133 105n78, 156
2.136 104n71
2.139 105
2.145 104n71
2.154–158 288
2.155 145, 173
2.159 104n71
5.136–247 286
5.187 117n110, 218n54
5.194 181
5.201–214 215n41
5.201 44nn16
5.205 44nn16
5.207–208 56nn16

Philo

- | | | | |
|--|------------------|---|----------------------|
| <i>De cherubim (Cher.)</i> | | <i>De praemiis et poenis (Praem.)</i> | |
| 115 | 198n329, 264n202 | 79–126 | 286 |
| | | 85–90 | 173–174 |
| <i>De vita contemplativa (Contempl.)</i> | | 88–89 | 179 |
| 1–90 | 286 | 88 | 174n263 |
| 23 | 124 | 98–107 | 134n157 |
| 24 | 124 | 100–101 | 154n210 |
| 35 | 104 | 101 | 156n215 |
| | | 107 | 131 |
| <i>De gigantibus (Gig.)</i> | | 119 | 186n291 |
| 14 | 198n329, 264n202 | 165–172 | 288 |
| | | 167 | 175n267 |
| <i>Hypothetica (Hypoth.)</i> | | 168–169 | 133 |
| 11.1–18 | 103n70, 286 | 171 | 170 |
| 11.1 | 124n127 | | |
| 11.2 | 105n76 | <i>Quod omnis probus liber sit (Prob.)</i> | |
| 11.4 | 105n77, 223n68 | 17 | 132 |
| 11.5 | 105n78, 156 | 75–91 | 103n70, 286 |
| 11.6–9 | 194 | 75 | 105n76 |
| 11.12 | 173n261 | 76–78 | 105n77, 136, 223n68 |
| | | 76 | 105, 124n127, 194 |
| <i>Legum allegoriae (Leg.)</i> | | 78 | 105, 175 |
| 1.3 | 93n30 | 80 | 104n71 |
| 1.43–44 | 197n327 | 85–87 | 136 |
| 1.45–46 | 192n314 | 86 | 105n77, 105n78, 156, |
| 1.45 | 174n264 | | 223n68 |
| 1.81–82 | 216n45 | 91 | 105n77, 105n78, 156, |
| 1.85 | 93 | | 223n68 |
| <i>De migratione Abrahami (Migr.)</i> | | <i>Questiones et solutiones in Genesin (QG)</i> | |
| 36–37 | 158n221 | 1.1–57 | 92, 285 |
| | | 1.6 | 93 |
| <i>De opificio mundi (Opif.)</i> | | 1.7 | 192n314 |
| 145–172 | 92, 285 | 1.10–11 | 162n238, 163 |
| 154 | 93n30 | 1.12–13 | 93–4 |
| 157 | 93n31 | 1.14 | 94, 174n264, 193 |
| 168–169 | 154n211 | 1.18 | 94, 174n264 |
| 169 | 193 | 1.23 | 193n321 |
| | | 1.30 | 94, 173n261 |
| <i>De plantatione (Plant.)</i> | | 1.32 | 92, 94, 174n264 |
| 32–40 | 92, 93n31, 285 | | |
| 32–35 | 197n327 | <i>De specialibus legibus (Spec.)</i> | |
| 38 | 192n314 | 2.42–48 | 124n127 |
| 40 | 167–168n247 | | |

Later Christian Works

- | | | | |
|--|------------------------|---|------------------|
| <i>Apocalypse of Paul (Apoc. Paul)</i> | | <i>Apocalypse of Peter (Apoc. Pet.)</i> | |
| 22 | 145, 148n196, 242n132, | 2 | 212n31 |
| | 243n134 | 14 | 211 |
| 24 | 243n134 | 16 | 165n244, 243n137 |

*The Book of the Resurrection of Christ by
Barnabas the Apostle* 145n187

Eusebius
Praeparatio evangelica (Praep. Ev.)
9.34.1–16 155n214

Irenaeus
Adversus haereses (Haer.)
5.33.3 148n196
5.33.4 177n272

GREEK AND ROMAN LITERARY WORKS

Aelian
De natura animalium (Nat. an.)
11 46n119, 55n151,
247n151, 280

Aeschylus
Fragments (frag.)
196 22n35, 51n143, 61n164,
74n207, 280
Prometheus Vincit (Prom.)
436–506 22n35, 53n147, 61n164

Apuleius
Metamorphoses (Metam.)
4.35 58n158

Aratus
Phaenomena (Phaen.)
96–136 19n24, 22n35, 59n160,
61, 63, 76n211, 79–80,
231n103, 265n206, 280

Aristophanes
Ranae (Ran.)
455 57n157

Aristotle
Athenian Politeia (Ath. Pol.)
16.7 59n160, 76n211
Ethica nichomachea (Eth. nic.)
8.1155 65n178
Politica (Pol.)
1262 42
1263 15n14, 43, 44
1320 15n14

Athenaeus
Deipnosophistae (Deipn.)
4.59C 39
6.267E–270A 39n97, 48, 50, 64, 75,
280

Babrius
Aesopic Fables
Prologue 51n143, 77n214

Caesar
Bellum gallicum (Bell. gall.)
6.21–23 23n36, 46n119, 60, 280

Catallus
Poems
14.15 40n100, 50n142

Cato
De Agricultura (Agr.)
Preface–1.7 33n73

Cicero
De republica (Resp.)
6.9–26 28, 56n153, 282

Dio Chrysostom
De tyrannide (Tyr.)
6.30–34 39n95, 58–59, 62

Diodorus Siculus
Library of History
1.45–47 37n89, 44n116, 63,
212n32
2.8–9 48n130, 212n32
2.47 18n22, 31, 46, 51n143,
55n151, 77, 265n204,
280
2.55–60 16n16, 18n22, 20n30,
23n37, 31, 42,
47–48n127, 48n128,
50n141, 51n143, 57, 58,
59n160, 64, 65–66,
73–74, 104, 231, 234,
241n131, 247n151, 280
3.2 78n218
3.15–23 42–43, 43n110, 63
3.68–69 54n150, 55n152,
57n157, 281
5.19–20 18n22, 31, 48n128,
51n143, 65, 74n206,
234, 252, 281
5.42–46 18n22, 23n36, 31,
32n70, 46n119,
48n128, 50n141, 55,

	74-75n207, 77, 231, 234, 265n204, 281	Homer	
6.1	31, 46n119, 74-75n207, 231, 265n204, 281	<i>Iliad</i> (<i>Il.</i>)	
		1.260-68	19n24
		1.423-425	31n63, 67n185, 79n218, 265n204
Diogenes Laertius		11.94	24
<i>Lives</i>		16.671-675	230n101
6.20-109	17n19, 23n37, 39, 42n108, 66n181	18.607-608	49
7.1-160	23n37, 39, 42, 123, 66n181, 67, 224n70, 279	<i>Odyssey</i> (<i>Od.</i>)	
		1.23	31n63, 67n185
		4.555-569	25, 58n158, 74n207, 282
		5.55-75	50n141, 54, 55n152, 281
Diogenianus		6.201-203	59n160
1.62	23n38	7.37-206	48-49, 50n141, 51n143, 77, 234-235, 265, 281
1.190	23n38		74-75n207
Epictetus		8.100-103	55n152, 74-75n207
<i>Discourses</i>		8.246-255	50n141, 51n143, 53, 63, 77n216
2.4.8-10	41n103	9.82-115	13n4, 50, 72, 73n203
3.24.67	39n95	10.487-540	68n192, 69n198, 72, 73n203
Euripides		11.1-640	
<i>Supplices</i> (<i>Suppl.</i>)			
201-203	53n147		
Herodotus		Horace	
<i>Historiae</i> (<i>Hist.</i>)		<i>Carmina</i> (<i>Carm.</i>)	
1.134	19-20n27	1.3	62n166
1.216	23n37, 41	2.15.1-20	23n36, 45, 46n119, 223, 281
3.20	74n206	3.6.1-48	
3.106	31-32	3.24.1-64	38, 76n211
4.32-36	46, 49	4.2.1-60	
4.104	41, 66	<i>Epodi</i> (<i>Epod.</i>)	
4.180	41-42	16.1-66	51n143, 59n160, 69n196, 74n207, 75, 282
Hesiod		<i>Epistulae</i> (<i>Ep.</i>)	
<i>Shield</i>		1.16.1-18	33n73, 48n128, 234
314-315	49n133	<i>Satirae</i> (<i>Sat.</i>)	
<i>Theogonia</i> (<i>Theog.</i>)		2.7	40n100, 50n142
211-226	230n101, 263n199		
<i>Works and Days</i> (<i>Op.</i>)		Hyginus	
90-155	18-19, 19n24, 27n54, 51n143, 62-63n171, 69, 74n207, 77, 263n110, 281	<i>Poetica astronomica</i>	
156-173	18-19, 25, 56, 263, 282	2.25	79n219, 265n206
225-247	59n160, 63-64n171, 74n207, 281	Isidore of Seville	
256-285	79, 265n206	<i>Etymologies</i>	
		14.6.8	50n141, 51, 281
Himerius		Isocrates	
<i>Orationes</i> (<i>Orat.</i>)		<i>Areopagiticus</i> (<i>Areop.</i>)	
14.10	46n120	35	15n14

- Justin
Hist. Phil. Epit.
 2.2 21, 36n85, 37n89,
 62n167, 222n66, 281
- Juvenal
Satirae (Sat.)
 6.1–24 23n38, 43n111
 13.28–59 23n38
- Lucian
Cataplus (Cat.)
 16–17 45n117
 24–29 45n117, 69n196, 71
Nigrinus
 14–16 22n60
Passing of Peregrinus
 13 223n68
Saturnalia (Sat.)
 1–9 45n117, 48n129,
 50n137, 51n143,
 55n152, 74n207
 10–18 45n117, 64n174,
 65n175, 74n207,
 74–75n207
 19–24 23n36, 40–41, 45n117,
 48n129, 50, 51n143,
 55n152, 74n207
 25–30 37n88
 31–39 23n36
Vera historia (Ver. hist.)
 1.3 31, 74
 2.4–29 23n37, 30–31, 40n101,
 44, 47, 48n128,
 50n137, 50n139,
 51n143, 54, 56n153, 57,
 58, 60, 73, 74n207, 75,
 80n221, 211n28, 223,
 235, 249, 282
- Lucretius
De Rerum Natura
 3.1–30 58, 59n160, 76n211
 5.925–1457 22n35, 23n38, 37n88,
 55n152, 61, 64n173,
 74n206, 231n103
- Macrobius
Saturnalia
 All 40n100, 50n142
- Marcus Aurelius
Meditations (Med.)
 3.11 14n8
 4.23 14n8
- Martial
Epigrams
 14 50n142
- Ovid
Amores (Am.)
 3.8.29–56 22n35, 23n36, 36n83,
 43n111, 51n143, 52,
 61n164, 62n166, 281
Ars amatoria (Ars)
 2.275–278 36
Metamorphoses (Metam.)
 1.1–223 19n24, 22n35, 23n36,
 36n83, 36n85, 43,
 43n111, 48n129, 51n143,
 53, 59n160, 61, 61n164,
 62, 62n166, 74n207,
 79n219, 80n220,
 222n66, 231n103,
 265n206, 281
 15.75–175 23, 54n150, 63–64, 281
- Pausanias
Graeciae description
 8.2.4 77
 10.5.7–9 46, 55, 247n151
- Pindar
Dirges frag.
 129 54, 57, 68, 282
 133 68n195
Olympionikai (Ol.)
 2.55–80 57, 58n158, 58n159,
 68, 74n207, 81n222,
 249n155, 263, 282
Pythianikai (Pyth.)
 10.25–50 55, 59n160, 68n187,
 74n206, 74n207,
 247n151, 281
- Plato
Apologia (Apol.)
 40C–41E 80n221, 282
Gorgias (Gorg.)
 523A–527E 29n58, 69, 70
 524A 30n61
Laws
 628C 65
 678C–679E 36n83, 36n85, 59n160,
 62n167, 65n176, 222n66
 684D 43
 713B–714B 51n143, 281
 740A 43
 761C 46n122, 48n130
 778C–D 46n122

- Phaedo (Phaed.)*
 81A 78, 265n205
 108C 69n196
 110B–111C 45, 58n159, 78, 265n205, 282
 112E–113C 131
 113D–114C 69, 69n196
Phaedrus (Phaedr.)
 249A 68n194, 71n200
Philebus (Phileb.)
 16C 77n214
Politicus (Pol.)
 273c–d 19n24
Respublica (Resp.)
 363A–E 50n141, 51n143, 65n176, 282
 416D 15n14
 468E–469A 27n54, 69
 592B 14, 35n79
 614A–621D 13n, 69n196, 283
 614A–D 29n58, 30n61, 71
 615A 29n57, 71n200
 617B–C 56n153
 619B 69n196
 621D 71n200
 739C 42
Timaeus (Tim.)
 41D–42D 29n58
- Pliny (the elder)
Naturalis historia (Nat.)
 2.64–65 57n156
 4.12.89–90 59n160, 74n206, 76n211, 281
 4.26 57n156
 5.8.45 41n103
 5.17.4 103n70, 105n77, 133n152, 223n68, 286
 6.13 74n206
 6.53 53n148
 16.1–2 57n156
- Pliny (the younger)
Epistulae (Ep.)
 1.14.4–6 33n73
- Plutarch
Camillus (Cam.)
 25.1 251n161
Lycurgus (Lyc.)
 3.1–2 67n183, 280
 8.3 15n14
Pelopidas (Pel.)
 34.5 251n161
- Sertorius (Sert.)*
 8.2–3 37n86, 52n144, 74n207, 75, 281
 9.1 59n160, 281
De Stoicorum repugnantitiis (Stoic rep.)
 1034b 47, 224n70, 280
 1044b–1045a 280
- Polybius
Historiae (Hist.)
 4.19–21 55, 68n189
- Pomponius Mela
Chorographia
 1.45 41n103
 3.36–102 52, 57n156, 76n210
- Porphyry
De abstinence (Abst.)
 4.2 23n38, 64, 76, 281
 4.3–4 39n94, 280
- Propertius
Elegies
 4.7.60–76 54, 54n150, 56, 283
- Pseudo-Eratosthenes
Catasterismi
 1.244 79n219, 265n206
- Pseudo-Seneca
Octavia
 377–437 22n35, 23n36, 36n83, 36n85, 43n111, 51n143, 59n160, 61n164, 62, 64n173, 79n219, 222n66, 265n206, 282
- Ptolemy
Geography
 7.5.2 49
- Quintilian
Inst.
 3.7.26–28 44n116, 212n32, 212–213
- Scylax
Periplus
 112 74n206
- Seneca
Epistulae Morales (Ep.)
 18.1–2 40n100, 50n142
 87.41 33n73
 90.36 43n111

- Medea (Med.)*
 301–379 61n165, 62n166 56, 59n160, 61–62,
 23n103, 282, 283
Naturales questions (Nat.) 1.10 50n141, 59n160
 5.18 61, 61n165, 62n166, 2.3 23n37, 23n38, 50n141
 23n103
- Phaedra (Phaedr.)*
 483–485 33n72
- Sextus Empiricus
Pyrrhoniae hypotyposes (Pyr.)
 1.160 280
 3.205–248 23n37, 41n103, 42n109,
 280
- Statius
Thebaid (Theb.)
 10.90 263n199
- Strabo
Geographica (Geogr.)
 1.1.4–6 31n63, 283
 3.2.13–14 31n65, 37, 74n207, 283
 4.6.5 53n148
 7.3.7–9 19, 23n37, 32, 61n164,
 68, 231
 11.4.1–8 22n35, 46n119, 48n128,
 50n141, 51n143, 60,
 61n164, 62n166,
 65n176, 68n190,
 74n206, 282
- Tacitus
Germania (Germ.)
 5 37n87, 65n176
 26 23n36, 43
 46 74n206
- Tibullus
Elegies
 1.3 22n35, 23n37, 43n111,
 51n143, 54n150,
- Valerius Flaccus
Argonautica (Argon.)
 1.842 57n156
- Varro
De re rustica (Rust.)
 2.1.1–25 23n38, 33n73, 51n143
 3.1.1–5 32–33
- Virgil
Aeneid (Aen.)
 6.268 263n199
 6.534–751 13n4, 30, 38n90,
 54n150, 55–56,
 57n157, 70–71, 73,
 247, 283
 8.306–336 22n35, 36n85, 59n160,
 61n164, 62n167,
 222n66, 282
Eclogae (Ecl.)
 4.1–45 50n141, 51n143,
 54n150, 59n160,
 61n164, 74n207,
 76n211, 80n220,
 183n287m, 282
Georgica (Georg.)
 1.126–145 43n111, 53, 61n164,
 62n166
 2.136–194 46n119, 48n128,
 50n141, 65n176,
 74n207, 282
 3.141–142 62n166
- Xenophon
Banquet
 4.34–44 39n95

INDEX OF SUBJECTS

- Adam and Eve 22n, 88–99, 118–119, 121n, 125, 145, 154n, 157n, 158–166, 170, 173–174, 180, 187–191, 192–193, 196–200, 217–218, 240, 243, 254, 260–261, 264, 266, 273
- Afterlife
 Astral 113n, 121–122, 186n
 Resurrection 95, 107–115, 118, 121–123, 157, 162, 169, 180,
 Transmigration 23–29
See Eschatology
- Anxiety 18, 41, 76, 82, 94, 141, 154, 156, 168, 179, 191–192, 258–260, 261, 263
- Audience-Oriented Approach
 Authorial Audience 7–8
 Implied Reader 7–8, 202, 207
 Original Audience 4–9, 201–208, 212, 223n, 274–275
- Aune, David 99, 103, 139, 151, 172, 203, 209–210, 215–216, 219, 224–225, 228–229, 236–237, 250–251, 253–256, 259, 264
- Bauckham, Richard 5–6, 94–95, 113–114, 137, 158, 210, 218, 229, 253, 255, 257
- Beavis, Mary Ann 4, 12, 83–87, 99–105, 117, 122, 141, 181
- Body 13, 29, 70–74, 78, 112n–113n, 121–123, 132, 185–187
- Bremmer, Jan 24–27, 56–57, 68, 87, 141, 143, 145
- Climate 58–59, 172–173, 251–252
See West Wind/Zephyr
- Clothing 20–21, 41, 58, 132–133, 136, 171, 173, 187–191, 220, 258
 Garments of Adam/Glory 187–191
- Collins, John J. 4, 83–85, 90, 96, 100, 102, 107–108, 113, 115–116, 119, 122–123, 135, 180–181, 183
- Communism 15, 22–23, 41–44, 46, 60n, 65–66, 76, 136, 223n, 272, 279
 Community of wives and children 23, 36–37, 41–44, 46, 65–66
See Panta koina
- Curse 189, 192–195, 197, 200, 209, 253–254, 260–264, 266–267, 273
- Cynicism 3, 12, 16–17, 20, 39, 42, 58–59, 62–63
- Dawson, Doyne 3, 12–17, 34–36, 39, 41–42, 47–48, 59, 60–61, 66, 85
- Edenic Utopianism 86–99
- Elysian Fields 30, 38n90, 54–56, 68–71, 73, 211, 247
- Eschatology
 Apocalyptic eschatology vs. prophetic eschatology 106–108, 112–113, 116n
 Eschatological banquet 149–153
 Eschatological pilgrimage
See Völkerwallfahrt
- Essenes 86, 102–105, 124n, 132–133, 136, 145, 156, 173, 175, 194, 223n, 270
- Ethiopians 31, 67, 78, 231, 265n
- Euhemerus (Panchea) 31–32, 55, 74–75n, 231, 281
- Eve
See Adam and Eve
- Exclusivism 180–181, 184, 200, 250, 254–258
See Inclusivism
- Ferguson, John 3, 20, 32, 38, 40–41, 44, 63–64, 73, 83
- Fragrance 53–54, 76, 91, 160, 163–166, 172, 199, 242–246, 248n, 266, 268
- Glory 89n, 96, 169–172, 186–191, 198–199, 208, 214, 218–220, 249–251, 267
- Golden Age 2, 12, 15, 17–20, 22n, 32, 98–99, 105n, 232n, 263n, 265, 279
- Great Reversal 126, 131–134, 137, 194n, 215, 217, 220–222, 266, 267
- Hades 24–25, 28–30, 49–50, 54, 56–57, 68–70, 72, 74, 110n, 114n, 131, 145, 229–230, 241
- Healing 48, 58, 76, 82, 104, 124, 139, 163, 175n, 183, 185–187, 209, 214, 233–235, 237, 242–245, 256, 266, 273
- Hyperboreans 31, 46, 54–55, 57, 67, 77, 231, 247, 265n
- Iambulus (Island of the Sun) 16n, 20, 31, 42, 47n–48n, 57–58, 64–66, 73–74, 104–105, 231, 234, 241, 280

- Inclusivism 172, 180–184, 200, 232, 234,
251, 254–258
See Exclusivism
- Island(s) of the Blessed 19, 24–25, 28,
30–31, 37, 40n, 44–45, 47, 51–52, 54, 60,
68–69, 71, 73, 75–76, 80, 145, 211n, 231,
242, 244n, 249, 263
- Jubilee, year of 102–103, 136, 199, 270
- Judgment 28–29, 69–72, 107, 113–114, 116,
119, 132, 148, 159, 161, 177–179, 183, 189,
228, 232, 235, 244, 257
Rhadamanthus 25, 29, 70–71
- Laus urbis* 44n, 212–214, 252, 272
- Leisure
See Work
- Light 56–57, 82, 167–172, 189, 208,
218–219, 248–251, 255–256, 267–268, 273
- Locative vs. utopian 84–86, 119, 122
- Lovejoy, Arthur and George Boas 12, 17,
19, 20–22, 33–34, 39–40, 53, 61, 67, 79,
105, 231
- Mathewson, David 10–11, 203, 212–213,
218, 227–229, 237, 251, 253, 255–259, 264
- Milk and honey 21, 40, 86, 99, 141–144,
164, 196, 232
- Music 54–56, 82, 166–167, 199, 246–248,
267, 273
- Natural Fecundity 51–53, 60, 75–76, 153,
156–57, 241, 261, 263
- Noble Savage 20, 67
- Orphism 26–27, 57
- Panta koina* 41
See Communism
- Peace 59–66, 82, 101–102, 124n, 138, 140,
173–179, 183, 199, 231, 252–254, 261, 267,
273
Tierfrieden (animal peace) 106n, 173,
178–179
- Physiognomy 186–187
- Primitivism 12–15, 17–23
Chronological 17–19, 22
Cultural 19–23
- Pythagoreanism 15, 26–27, 68n194, 72, 74
- Resurrection
See afterlife, eschatology
- Righteousness/Virtue 20–21, 24, 28–29,
46, 57, 67–69, 72, 78, 90, 93, 95, 105,
110, 115, 117–118, 120–121, 132–133, 135,
140, 143–145, 170–171, 173, 179, 184–186,
213–214, 254, 267
- Ruiten, Jacques van 92, 124, 137–138, 188,
228, 259, 264
- Sabbath 102–103, 199, 270
- Saturn (Cronus) 15, 18, 25, 33, 39, 40–41,
50, 52–53, 64–65, 68, 79–80, 222n,
- Saturnalia 40, 50, 64–65, 222, 281
- Scythian 21, 37–38, 42, 53, 68
- Segal, Alan 23–24, 27–29, 108–109, 111,
113–114
- Serpent (Edenic) 89, 91–92, 94, 119, 158,
178, 192–193, 197
- Sheol 109–111, 114, 132, 158n, 238
- Stoicism 3n, 12, 16, 20, 42n, 47, 48n, 67,
135n, 136n
- Technology 9, 22, 32, 36, 52–53, 60–61,
63, 66, 193, 271
Agricultural 9, 20, 22, 52–53, 60–61,
193, 271
Nautical 22, 32, 53, 60–61, 271
- Therapeutai 83, 86, 102–105, 124, 270
- Tierfrieden* (animal peace)
See Peace
- Topos*
Definition 9–10
- Tree of Knowledge 88n, 89–91, 157–163,
164–165, 187–188, 191n, 199, 238n–239n,
240, 243
- Tree of Life 88n, 89–91, 92n, 98, 118, 120,
122, 124n, 150, 157–163, 164n, 165, 172, 197,
199, 208, 210, 211n, 222n, 230, 236–246,
251–252, 258, 260, 262, 266–268, 273
- Urzeit/Endzeit* 95, 99n, 106, 117–118, 123,
190, 199, 210n, 240, 267
- Vegetarianism 23, 61, 63–65, 98
- Virtue
See Righteousness
- Völkerwallfahrt* 117, 180n, 182, 215, 218,
220, 251, 256–257, 268, 272–273
- War
See Peace
- West Wind/Zephyr 25, 58, 173
- Work 53, 74–76, 81–82, 102, 192–195, 200,
260–264
- Wine 13, 40, 48, 50, 82, 112, 138, 143, 147–149,
150, 152–153, 155–157, 160n, 163–164, 183,
199, 209, 232, 235, 242, 266, 273